

ANGLO- SOVIET JOURNAL

CONTENTS

Encounters in Britain	A. Khachatryan
Automation in the USSR	S. Lilley
Soviet Historical Science	A. L. Sidorov
Soviet Antarctic Expedition	W. G. Cass
Academy of Sciences and Britain	A. V. Topchiev
A Visit to a Pioneer Camp	Janet M. Morell
British and Russian Historians	A. M. Pankratova
British-Soviet Trade	Andrew Rothstein
Teachings of Michurin	N. Tsitsin
Magician in Moscow	Horace King

AND BOOK REVIEWS, ETC.

VOLUME XVII  NUMBER 1

SPRING
1956

TWO SHILLINGS & SIXPENCE

SCR

14 KENSINGTON SQUARE, LONDON, W.8 WEStern 1571-4

OFFICERS 1955-56

President and Chairman of Executive Committee

D. N. PRITT, Q.C.

Vice-Chairman

A. W. L. KESSEL, M.C., M.B.E., F.R.C.S.

Honorary Secretary

D. T. RICHNELL, B.A.

Secretary

ELEANOR FOX

Executive Committee

MISS S. BRENNER, Ph.D., R. BROWNING, M.A., LEONARD CASSINI, DUDLEY COLLARD, DR. L. CROME, M.C., M.R.C.P., H. GOLOMBEK, MARTIN LAWRENCE, MISS D. LEVIN, MISS MARY MERRALL, THE HON. IVOR MONTAGU, ANDREW ROTHSTEIN, M.A., GORDON SANDISON, PROF. J. S. SPINK, MISS JUDITH TODD, PROF. C. L. WRENN, CDR. E. P. YOUNG, R.N. (rtd.).

Sections

Architecture & Planning. *Chairman :* A. L. Ling, A.R.I.B.A., A.M.T.P.I.

Chess. *President :* Prof. L. S. Penrose, F.R.S. *Vice-President :* I. R. Vesselo.

Education. *President :* Lady Simon of Wythenshawe. *Vice-Presidents :* G. D. B. Gray, Dr. G. B. Jeffery, F.R.S., Prof. J. A. Lauwerys, Dr. Janet Vaughan, Dame Olive Wheeler. *Chairman :* Miss D. Levin.

History & Archaeology. *President:* Prof. V. Gordon Childe. *Chairman:* Robert Browning, M.A.

Legal. *Chairman :* Dudley Collard. *Hon. Secretary :* D. Veall.

Literature. *President :* Sir Compton Mackenzie, O.B.E., LL.D. *Chairman :* Prof. C. L. Wrenn.

Medical. *Chairman :* Dr. Mary Barber. *Secretary :* Dr. L. Crome.

Science. *Chairman :* Dr. J. P. Harding. *Secretary :* Dr. D. R. Newth, B.Sc.

Theatre. *President :* Miles Malleison. *Vice-Presidents :* John Burrell, Joseph McLeod, Dame Sybil Thorndike.

The ANGLO - SOVIET JOURNAL

Spring 1956. Volume XVII, Number 1

Editor : Andrew Rothstein, M.A. Assistant Editor : Stella Jackson, B.A.
Editorial Office : 14 Kensington Square, London, W.8. Tel. : WESTern 1571.

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Encounters in Britain A. Khachaturyan	4
Automation in the USSR S. Lilley	9
Problems and Achievements of Soviet Historical Science A. L. Sidorov	14
A Visit to a Pioneer Camp Janet M. Morell	23
The USSR Academy of Sciences and its Scientific Links with Britain A. V. Topchiev	26
A Magician in Moscow Horace King	30
Anglo-Russian Relations in the Field of Historical Studies A. M. Pankratova	35
The Soviet Antarctic Expedition W. G. Cass	42
Michurin and his Teachings N. Tsitsin	43
The Plan and British-Soviet Trade Andrew Rothstein	50
SCR Notes	53
Book Reviews	57
<i>(Bees : Chess and Chessmasters : Correspondence between Prince Kurbsky and Ivan IV : Korolenko's Siberia : Oxford Slavonic Papers V : Pares's History of Russia : Pavlova, a Biography Pushkin's Tales of Belkin : Russian Poetry Reader I : Russian Prose Readers I and II : Stalin's Works, Vols. XI, XII and XIII Turgenev's Fathers and Sons : Turgenev's Poems in Prose Turgenev's Rudin)</i>	
Pavlovian Physiology and Psychology Study Course	60

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION 10/- post free ; SCR members 8/6 ; joint SCR/ASJ subscription 19/- with reduction to 11/- for students. Single copies 2/6, post, etc., 3d.
Back numbers available.

Journal of the Society for Cultural Relations with the USSR

Reproduction of any article or review in the "Anglo-Soviet Journal," in whole or in part, is permitted provided that the ASJ reference is given and a copy of the reproduction sent to the Editor.

SCR Annual Subscription Rates

General Membership

London and Home Counties 10/6
Country and Students 5/-

Section Membership (addit.)

Per Section 5/-

Anglo-Soviet Journal

Non-members of SCR 10/-
SCR members 8/6

Bulletins

Per subject 6/-

Architecture : Chess : Film
Education : History : Legal
Literature : Medical : Music
Theatre : Psychology : Science
Social Sciences

Membership of the Society for Cultural Relations with the USSR is open to British and Soviet citizens resident in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Citizens of other countries may be admitted in special circumstances.

What SCR offers

An Active Part in the promotion and extension of cultural relations and exchanges with the USSR.

Contact with Soviet cultural organisations and Soviet scientists, musicians, artists and men of letters.

Information Services providing replies to a very wide range of inquiries.

Publications giving both general and specialised information on Soviet scientific and cultural developments.

Library Service of 10,000 Russian and English books and an extensive range of Soviet specialised, scientific and general periodicals.

Visual Aids for lectures, teachers and illustrators.

Talks and Lectures by Soviet visitors to Britain and British visitors to the USSR.

Concerts and Recitals by Soviet and British artists, in person and on Soviet tape-recordings.

Music Library of records and sheet music, both classical and modern.

Lecture Service for public and private meetings.

Exhibitions of books, paintings, photographs, handicrafts, etc.

Local Committees in a number of provincial cities.

The Society for Cultural Relations with the USSR

CULTURAL relations are a means towards understanding between peoples, in which the private person has a part to play no less important than that of governments, diplomats and official bodies.

With every year the importance of these relations increases.

The Society for Cultural Relations with the USSR has for more than thirty years enabled the private individual—artist, writer, professional worker, scholar or scientist—to contribute to and benefit from the fostering of cultural relations between Great Britain and the Soviet Union.

The Society plays a unique part by helping to make the achievements of British art, medicine, science and general culture known throughout the USSR, not only to the general public, but also to the leading personalities in Soviet professional and artistic life.

At the same time, the Society, through its varied activities, gives the private citizen in the United Kingdom opportunities to become personally acquainted with Soviet cultural developments and to meet Soviet scientists, artists and men of letters.

The SCR invites you to take part in its activities and make use of its facilities, and to contribute, through membership of the Society, to a fruitful growth of reciprocal cultural relations between this country and the USSR.

**For further information on the work of the Society, its
branches and its professional Sections, please write to**

*The Hon. Secretary,
Society for Cultural Relations with the USSR,
14 Kensington Square, London, W.8.*

ENCOUNTERS IN BRITAIN

A. Khachaturyan

OF THE multitude of impressions I received in connection with our trip to Britain, the main and most precious was the keen interest displayed by the British intellectuals in everything that represented the activities of Soviet intellectuals, and the genuine effort they made to understand our way of life. All the lectures and talks on Soviet music in Britain were well attended, whether delivered to musicians and specialists in the London club of the Guild of Composers or to larger audiences elsewhere. I was questioned about life in the USSR, about the structure of the Union of Composers, about our way of life, about the position of young musicians, the rate of pay for orchestral players and possible unemployment among them, and whether our concert halls are ever empty.

Needless to say, I always answered the last two questions in the negative, explaining that our concert halls are unfilled only on those occasions when an unsuccessful work is performed once too often. My listeners learned with astonishment and delight of the material and moral conditions in which the musicians of the USSR live ; of our frequent stimulating discussions ; of the free manuscript-copying service ; of homes for composers ; and many other things. All this seems so simple and ordinary to us that we do not even notice the advantages which surround artists in our country.

During the many interviews I had I described our way of life in detail. It must be remembered that our trip to Britain took place before a certain thaw in the atmosphere of the cold war set in. Consequently all the questions I was asked were the same, and soon I knew them by heart. I knew that the third question from the reporters would invariably be : " Is creative work free in the Soviet Union ? "

Now that the spirit of friendship and cultural relationship is spreading over the world, I think the London press might be interested in many other sides of our life.

Anyway, at that time, just before the Geneva conference, journalists hardly listened to my answer to their first two questions but rapidly filled their notebooks with my answer to the third. They usually disregarded what was not of immediate interest to them. A pity ; for while the first question (" How are you ? ") might of course be considered inessential, the answer to the second (" How do you like Britain ? ") would be worth listening to and publishing, since it was made by one of the Soviet friends of the British people.

I told them that a great many things delighted me in Britain—from the British Museum to the Old Vic Theatre, from the Royal Academy of Music to Covent Garden. And also the people, often so very different from each other : students, professors, clergymen, musicians, politicians, chauffeurs, workmen. Very many of them, even then, spoke of a possibility of creating a very close friendly cultural contact between the peoples of our two countries.

I had the opportunity of meeting one of the oldest and undoubtedly one of the most distinguished composers in Britain, Arthur Bliss. This is not the place to discuss his piano concerto, nor his opera *The Olympians*, and other works well known all over the world. I was fascinated not only by his music but by the composer himself. For all his sixty-nine years, he is upright and handsome. His face is still youthful, while his hair is quite grey ; his eyes are clear and blue and amazingly candid. His quiet, unhurried words are full of sincerity, and he appeared to be anxious to find out the truth for himself. He talked with much erudition, welcomed us hospitably, and listened to our every word with keen

interest and an obvious desire to investigate. I was very sorry that one cannot talk intimately at an official reception.

Arthur Bliss is one of the most respected composers in Britain, and no doubt could have told us a great deal about the musical life of his country. Maybe, too, he would have been interested in what I had to say. But I trust that our first encounter will by no means be the last, and that we will have other opportunities to speak together on matters of interest to both.

In Britain I heard some noteworthy and vivid music. In London I saw the opera *Troilus and Cressida*, by William Walton, the author of an excellent concerto which is played by leading violinists all over the world. The opera appealed to me mostly through the part of the heroine (a very youthful and melodious part), for its masterful orchestration, and because the composer possesses all the secrets of modern technique. There is, however, some sense of poverty in the vocal line, and a lack of expressiveness in the music of some of the episodes.

The second and third movements of Malcolm Arnold's Second Symphony are emotionally moving, in spite of its dryness and abstract way of thinking. The composer displays virtuosity in orchestration. I told Malcolm Arnold quite plainly what I liked or disliked in his work, and rather astonished him by doing so. It is not done there either to praise or to criticise so openly. However, he appeared to be an exceptionally kind and understanding man, and he listened with obvious attention and interest to my opinions, which were not always complimentary.

I heard Edmund Rubbra's melodious quartet with much pleasure.

It is true that not everything in the works of British composers appeals to me. Occasionally I had to listen to compositions in which the insistence on originality at all costs turned into empty eccentricity, and the music became dry, dull, abstract and totally devoid of any contact either with the best national traditions of the country or with any bright contemporary intonations of the life around us. When saying this, I by no means wish to impose my point of view on my British colleagues. We Soviet composers no doubt have works which when performed in London would appear naive and imperfect and our colleagues in Britain have some compositions which Moscow listeners would consider crude cacophony; yet each side has something to learn from the other. We all follow our own track. But I passionately desire a closer understanding between British and Russian composers. I would like them to find that common language in music which is so essential to all who take the problems of contemporary music to heart.

I think we ought to meet oftener, talk more, perform each other's compositions and persuade each other by means of our chief weapon, music. I am convinced, and I often mentioned this in Britain, that a true artist, whatever his artistic aspirations, cannot be without ideas or exist outside reality. An idea will make itself felt in a composition, even unconsciously. An artist will always tell of the life he has been able to see, and the more acute is his conception of reality the more faithfully it will be represented in his work. And if he genuinely loves life, and reacts favourably to his background, he will be able to find the all-conquering power of spiritual light, and his compositions will be sincere and philosophically optimistic.

I also want to mention my meeting with the composer William Alwyn, professor at the Royal Academy of Music. Together with the director of the Academy, Reginald Thatcher, Mr. Alwyn showed me round their remarkable institution. It has the same faculties and classes as all the best conservatoires of music in the world. Students can study dramatic art, elocution and voice production, and hear lectures on the history of the theatre and of costume, English poetry, psychology and radio technique. Some of these courses are extras, however, for which the fees are additional.

The Academy has a good students' orchestra, which happened to be rehearsing Chaikovsky's piano concerto when I was there. Although it was a rough rehearsal with many stops and corrections, both piano and orchestra sounded very well.

In Bristol I was able to listen to an excellent students' choir, conducted by Professor Stanton. It consisted not only of students of music but also of other faculties in the local university. I heard this choir of 500 voices sing Mozart's Requiem. Clear intonation and a thoroughly musical interpretation of this complicated work are not always obtained even at professional performances, but in this case the great Mozart work sounded impeccable. Altogether the standard of choir singing in Britain is very high.

I would also like to mention with gratitude and appreciation the London Philharmonic Orchestra, the Hallé Orchestra in Manchester, and the BBC Orchestra, which I conducted.

In Liverpool I made acquaintance with the activities of the Philharmonic Society, one of the three oldest organisations of this type in the world. It has celebrated its 115th year. Its playing is of a very high standard. The Liverpool Symphony Orchestra, an object of care and pride on the part of the citizens, gives 200 concerts annually in various towns in Britain, which are always very successful. One of Britain's best choirs performs with this orchestra. Musicians also organise lecture-concerts and concerts for institutions and various establishments, and on such occasions all seats at the Philharmonic are sold at a flat rate accessible to workers.

The Liverpool Philharmonic Orchestra helps a Youth Philharmonic Society which has 3,000 members, musicians and singers. Through its club, the Liverpool Philharmonic Orchestra is in touch with its audiences and studies their interests, and in response to requests often performs Russian classics and Soviet composers.

It is a comfortable thought that this encounter has engendered a mutual sympathy between Soviet and British artists. Our lively conversations were full of those practical problems of work and of life in general which can only occur in a very friendly and affectionate company.

In spite of some aesthetic and other differences of opinion, our intellectuals and the British intellectuals have much in common. We are united by a common interest in creative work, by an endeavour to know each other, by respect for the cultural achievements of the people, by a desire to keep and strengthen peace. I have come to the conclusion that we have much to say to each other, and in friendly discussion we can find the necessary formulations and viewpoints required to reconcile what seemed irreconcilable only yesterday.



IN the British Museum you can see Shakespeare's Sonnets, published in his lifetime in 1609, and the first edition of his works, published after his death; also masterpieces of Greek art, manuscripts 2,000 years old, and still more ancient mosaics. You can walk round the Reading Room, where 5,000,000 books are stored for the benefit of readers. Here in the British Museum Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels worked. Here Lenin wrote his *Materialism and Empirio-criticism*.

In the London art galleries I had more than one opportunity to become convinced that ordinary people have good and healthy taste. At least, there was a noticeable predominance of crowds in the National Gallery and the Tate Gallery near the masterpieces of realistic painting and sculpture. The attention paid to a work of art is, in my mind, a criterion of the taste and preference of the public.

Bellini, Rubens, Rembrandt, Raphael and Van Dyck attract the crowds in the London National Gallery just as much as they do in the Leningrad

Hermitage. Normal people are the same everywhere, and they have the same reaction to beauty. In this alone I see a basis for international exchange and an introduction to the greatest spiritual treasures possessed by all nations. I was very impressed by the pictures of the English school, by Gainsborough, Reynolds, Turner.

The Tate Gallery was founded comparatively recently, at the end of the last century, by the then Prince of Wales. Three thousand works by English artists and 500 examples of foreign painting and sculpture give exhaustive proof of the undoubted superiority of the great and animated realism of Turner and Hogarth over the tortured creations of abstractionists, surrealists and cubists. As to the impressionists, here the matter is somewhat more complicated. Looking at the masterpieces of Degas and Renoir, I thought that some critics are not altogether right in considering them impressionists, and that the argument over the role of the artist in the history of art, and especially of the emotional effect of their work on the public, is by no means concluded. I am not speaking of the reactionary theories abundantly piled up around this movement, but of the concrete creations of great artists. Their works are vivid, contagious in mood, and beautiful.

But I must admit that the latest sculpture represented in this gallery does not convince me in the least. As with the attempt to persuade me into accepting the free gravitation of some English composers towards idea-less and abstract music, so I could not but doubt these sculptors' freedom of expression and lack of ideas, and was led to suppose that this theory harboured its own reactionary ideas.

Perhaps Reginald Butler created his *Woman* out of forged iron on the spur of an involuntary inspiration; perhaps Alberto Giacometti when modelling his bronze *Man Pointing* was led by some exacting superior urge which impels a creator to express himself in his work. But *why* do all these works appear simultaneously, and why are they so similar in their denial of the beauty, strength and harmony of man? Why is this art so unhumanistic that it sees only one possibility of expression, by negating its human origin and everything beautiful it ever had, presenting a woman as a horrible iron construction or a man as a disproportioned headless creature? Where does this come from? From a "freedom" of creation; from an "individual" conception of the world? But, if so, why this similarity of one work to another? I cannot believe in it.

I was shown pictures by the American artist Whistler, who had lived in Britain and in France, and I was assured that his impressionism in painting found a direct counterpart in music, and that Debussy, having seen Whistler's pictures, was inspired to compose his nocturnes. But I failed to reconcile the gloomy, misty colours of this painter's pictures with the clear, transparent moods of Debussy's music.

To the honour of the British, it must be said that they not only show a marked preference for healthy straightforward art, but that among the contemporary artists there are not so very many complete formalists. In comparison with the art and music of modern fashion-creators in other western countries, the British are somewhat behindhand. Personally I am delighted, since it allows me to mention two welcome facts. The first looks like a generalisation. The good taste of a healthy people, its traditions of independence in art, are everlasting. The second is more personal. The works by contemporary artists which I saw, and the compositions of modern musicians, do not all tally with the labels of various "isms" attached to them. And what was fine, lively and convincing in them allowed me to believe in the permanency of the realistic nature of British art and its best representatives.

This optimistic belief in the present, and in a good future for British art, was a great deal strengthened by the London theatre, especially the Old Vic,

where I saw Shakespeare's *Macbeth*. This modest theatre was created by the efforts of a few enthusiasts, led by Lilian Baylis, away from the noise and commotion of the fashionable theatrical district ; here for a moderate price simple working people can see Shakespeare's works performed by the best actors in the country, who deem it an honour to act there.

This theatre fascinated me. And if I had to explain why in one word the word would be realism. The realism of acting holds and conquers one at once. As quite an ordinary theatregoer, I was delighted with the excellent performance of the actors, who know how to get emotions across to the audience without any visible effort.

On the opera stage of Britain, too, realism is alive. *Der Rosenkavalier*, by Richard Strauss, is presented at Covent Garden as a realistic spectacle. I think that the basis for this realistic interpretation was found by the producer, Christopher West, and by the excellent conductor, Rudolph Kempe, in the music itself. It is expressive, rich in structure, polyphonic, magnificently orchestrated, and has a whole stream of vivid, impressive melodies. Covent Garden is the best opera house in Britain ; and I was delighted to find good taste in the ascendancy there.



EVERYWHERE in Britain we met kind and devoted friends of our country and friends of peace. There was a cordial encounter between Soviet artists and the miners in Cardiff. Petrov, Tirsova, Struchkova and Lapauri were highly successful ; our shows were full everywhere. I remember miners' wives bringing us tea and sandwiches during a concert. They looked after us with motherly kindness and care ; in their words and questions and remarks on life in general there was so much heartfelt warmth and regard that we at once felt at home with these people so near to us in spirit, people who profoundly trust us and who know very well that Soviet people are their friends. The same welcoming atmosphere prevailed at an official dinner arranged in honour of Soviet artists by Dr. German in Cardiff.

The woman teacher who gave me a lift from Birmingham to Stratford-on-Avon spoke with animation of her horror of bombs dropping on her town and of children having to live in underground shelters. Her name is Joan Leighton ; she is the mother of two children. Her husband, an electrical engineer, shares her attitude to war. Our conversation proved how important individual contact is in developing friendly relations between two nations.

In Bristol Cathedral, when the minister heard Russian spoken, he approached us with a radiant smile, told us of his love of music, and said that our language seemed to him the most musical of all and that he hoped to visit our country. Here, too, under the great arches of this church, the expression of good will towards our country was unmistakable.

In Manchester I conducted the magnificent Hallé Orchestra. It has in its repertoire many works by the Russian classics and by Soviet composers. The programme of my concert included an overture, *In the South*, by the British composer Elgar, whose music contains rich and beautiful melodies. In this overture, pastoral moods alternate with stormy passages. Warlike themes gradually give way to peaceful melodies, as " wars pass away, but shepherds remain ", as the programme notes said.

The creators of all the material and spiritual treasures of the people are not satisfied with the fact that wars pass ; they do not want wars to take place at all. We love Britain for her simple, kindly folk, great workers, modest and reliable. We met them everywhere, in the capital, and among the Cardiff miners, and at the Lord Mayor's reception in Birmingham, and in the workers' quarters of Manchester. And these encounters are the main impressions I received in Britain.

Translated by ANNA COLLINGWOOD.

AUTOMATION IN THE USSR

S. Lilley, M.Sc., Ph.D.

AUTOMATION being a burning issue in this country at the moment, it seemed desirable that somebody should see at first hand what was being done about it in the Soviet Union. I was privileged to undertake this task through the help of the SCR and its Soviet counterpart, VOKS, and with the backing of shop stewards representing 125,000 workers in the British car industry, who are eager to know what impact automation has on the lives of people in a socialist economy.

So far little has been published in the western press about Soviet automation (and be it said that this is not the fault of the Russians, for they showed me willingly all I could ask to see in the time available, and answered all my questions without reserve). From that little, I reached two provisional conclusions: first, that there is as yet less automation in the USSR than in the USA (and probably less than in Britain); but, second, that the most daring Russian experiments go considerably farther than anything that has been done elsewhere. My visits and discussions confirmed both conclusions.

The most important practical form of automation in the engineering industries at present is the *transfer machine*. This is equivalent to a line of standard machines for drilling, milling, tapping and the like, each operating automatically and all connected by automatic transport, so that the work passes through a dozen or more stations and is subjected to some hundreds of machining operations without human intervention. In the Stalin Automobile Works in Moscow (where 42,000 workers turn out 120,000 lorries, buses and cars per year, besides 400,000 bicycles and 40,000 refrigerators) I saw transfer machines at work which would have been perfectly at home in any of the larger British car factories. One, for machining gear-box casings under the supervision of one worker, replaces fifteen standard machines. Another does 380 operations on engine blocks at the rate of thirty-five per hour, and is cared for by three workers.

But altogether there were less than a dozen transfer machines in the factory, whereas a large British plant at present might have fifty or more. In fact, as the chief engineer told me, they are introducing automation piecemeal, as opportunity arises. With the factory working to capacity all the time, they cannot stop for any major retooling. In this respect their situation is very like that in Britain and very different from that in America, where the regular seasonal slack period is often used for radical re-equipping.

To choose the Stalin Works for the comparison is not quite fair, for it is technically less advanced than, say, the Molotov Automobile Works at Gorky, or the tractor factories at Stalingrad and Minsk. But when all this is allowed for it remains clear that while Soviet transfer machines are technically comparable to ours there are at present fewer of them.

These remarks apply to machines working on the types of processes that were earliest automated in all countries—essentially processes in which comparatively large blocks of metal are subjected to operations, like drilling and milling, in which the work remains stationary and the tool moves. Automatic machinery involving operations like turning and grinding has developed significantly only within the last two or three years, and as soon as one turns to this field one gets the impression that Soviet work is comparable to that of the west both in quantity and in quality. In the Stankokonstruktsiya Machine-tool Building Factory I saw under construction (with parts of it working) a line for machining tractor piston rings. The blanks pass through the machine on cylindrical fixtures holding twenty-four at a time. The processes include cutting the gap,

pressing the rings to close the gap and give the right degree of spring (pressure automatically controlled), grinding both internal and external surfaces (grinding stops automatically at the right diameter), grooving the external surface of one ring in four (since the tractor uses one grooved ring and three plain), finish grinding, inspecting all measurements (with automatic ejection of faulty rings), greasing, wrapping, boxing and loading on to the conveyor to the store. Three men take charge of the line and replace the twenty-five workers formerly needed. Several such machines are already at work.

Another interesting line, of which unfortunately I could only see plans and photographs, does the turning and assembling (but not, of course, the winding) of 300 armature shafts per day, and can be quickly adapted for various sizes. Two workers take the place of a former thirty, and again several such lines have been in operation for some years. Another application, which (as far as I know) has not been made elsewhere, is for the production of tractor ploughshares. This machine starts with sheet metal, rolls it, grinds the surfaces, does the heat treatment, and follows this up by cleaning and oiling the shares, subjecting them to anti-rust treatment, packing them and loading them into wagons. The labour required is reduced to one-tenth.

It is, however, in the automation of processes much more complicated than these that the most interesting Soviet work is being done. The supreme example is an automatic line set up in 1950-51 for making car pistons at the rate of 3,500 per 24-hour day under the attention of only nine men.* It starts with aluminium ingots loaded on to a conveyor, and it does the casting, trimming, heat treatment, hardness testing, all the machining processes (turning, grooving, drilling, grinding, polishing, etc.), degreasing, tinplating and washing completely automatically. It ends by sorting out and marking the four sizes of pistons that are worked simultaneously, inspecting all measurements, greasing the pistons, wrapping them in parchment paper, packing them in boxes of six and stacking them ready for dispatch. It cuts total staff to one-quarter, manual workers to one-sixteenth, and production costs to one-half. For comparison, the latest American piston line that I know of (Pontiac 1955) does not include the casting, heat treatment or rough turning, but has the higher production rate of 200 per hour.

This piston plant is, I think, the most complete automatic production line in existence today, and I was sorry not to be able to see it in action; but it is now at work in a factory on the Volga, which was unfortunately outside the range of my travels. However, at the Kaganovich First State Ball-bearing Factory in Moscow I did see machinery that is very nearly as advanced.

Some years ago Engineer V. A. Morozov took over a shopful of old multi-spindle automatic lathes in this factory, fitted them with automatic loading and unloading devices and connected them by a conveyor system to make a completely automatic plant for machining ball-bearing races. The conveyor has fifteen separate channels, which can take different sizes of races, and these are automatically fed to the appropriate machines. Furthermore, several lathes work in parallel on any particular job, the conveyor distributing the work among them. Add a few automatic inspection units, and it will be seen that Morozov produced a remarkably complete piece of automation, all the more impressive because some of the lathes with which he started were as much as twenty years old. A woman worker now attends four lathes instead of a former two, and her work consists in such things as making minor adjustments to the lubrication system. Total labour requirements are cut by 27%, machine utili-

* Fuller descriptions will be found in *The Factory of the Future*, by R. Parker (*Russia Today*, August 1951, pp. 11-13) and in *Automatic Factories*, by S. Lilley (*Discovery*, April 1955, pp. 150-1). See also *Soviet Science and Engineering Bulletin*, Vol. 2, No. 1 (February 1955); available for reference in SCR Library.

sation is increased by 25%, and—despite the wage increase that always accompanies automation—production costs are cut by 10%.

This is one of the few Soviet examples that has been described with technical detail in English,* and luckily I recognised the shop at sight and was able to show the director and his assistants a short description I had written in the *Discovery* article mentioned above. They were naturally pleased to find their work known in England, and it was with redoubled enthusiasm that they showed me their later achievements—first an improved version of the Morozov line, by Engineer Knyazkov, using more modern machines, and then a new shop, working when I saw it under test conditions, which does almost the complete manufacture of four sizes of ball- and roller-bearings automatically.

My first impression on entering this last was of extreme cleanness. It was more like a modern office than a metal-working factory. With most of the working parts of the machines covered in and viewed when necessary through glass, there is no scattering of lubricants, coolants or metal dust to foul the air and settle dirtily on the floor. True there is more noise than in most offices, but on the other hand the workers have a much more leisurely time—their job is mainly to watch the machines so that incipient faults can be corrected before any serious damage is done.

The balls (or rollers) and the separators are supplied from other parts of the factory, which I did not see and which are presumably not yet so automatic. But this shop does all the machining and heat-treatment operations on the races, and the assembly of all parts to make complete bearings. As in the Morozov shop, the conveyor system copes with sorting races of various sizes and with distributing them among machines working in parallel.

The blanks for the races, coming from the foundry, are tipped into a hopper. The conveyor picks them up and passes them to multi-spindle automatics, where all the necessary turning operations are performed. Thence they pass to a set of furnaces and cooling chambers which subject them to a complicated heat treatment. Next they are demagnetised, and then subjected to a series of grinding operations on the several faces and grooves. This is followed by polishing processes, washing, and then automatic inspection of thirty dimensions (with faulty parts automatically ejected into different channels which indicate precisely what is wrong). Races which pass the test move on to the assembly section, where they meet the balls and separators and emerge as complete bearings. These then pass through another automatic inspection station, are given anti-rust treatment, wrapped and boxed—and all this is untouched by human hand.

The play allowed in the final bearing is six microns (about 1/4000 inch) and the assembly contains an ingenious arrangement by which the diameters of the two races are measured and they are then supplied from an array of hoppers with balls of just the right size to bring the play within the required tolerance. The heat treatment section works three shifts and the rest of the plant two. To make this possible there are storage bunkers at various points, into which the races are automatically fed and from which they are automatically called by the machine that does the next operation.

As I saw the shop, working under test, a few transfer operations were being performed manually where links still required adjustment, and all inspections were being manually checked. But when complete, the whole process from delivery of the blanks into hoppers to the stacking of the packed bearings will be entirely automatic.

The planned output is 900,000 ball-bearings and 600,000 roller-bearings per annum. About 160 workers will be employed. The director put the saving in labour at about one-third, but from a general view of the process I judged that

* *The Machinist*, April 10, 1954, 601-6.

to be a very modest estimate—unless, indeed, he was comparing this new shop with lines of Morozov or Knyazkov type which are already automatic.

Automation is developing so rapidly in places that it is dangerous to make comparisons. Nevertheless, I must take the risk of saying that I believe the piston factory and this ball-bearing shop represent a degree of automatic operation more complete than anything that has yet been done elsewhere.

Let us turn now from machines to the human beings they serve. What do the Soviet people think about automation? To answer this question I talked not only to factory directors, research workers and engineers, but also to leading trade unionists in the various factories. All of them—and in this the trade unionists were the most emphatic—said without hesitation that the Soviet workers enthusiastically welcomed automation and eagerly encouraged its introduction on all possible occasions. It will be worth while to analyse the reasons they gave.

Automation eases their labour. And indeed that is obvious. Though the workers on, say, the final assembly conveyors at the Stalin Works, which is not automated, are by no means hard pressed, nevertheless their conditions do not compare with those on the automatic lines, where the workers mostly “stand and wait”. Of course, any automatic line has its moments of crisis (which I did not witness), when something goes wrong and a lot has to be done very fast, but for the most part the people on these lines spend their time quietly watching the machine’s performance and occasionally making minor adjustments. It has been said that on the famous piston machine the maintenance staff do only twenty minutes of active work per shift, and spend the rest of the time playing chess!

It increases productivity and therefore raises the standard of living. Nobody doubts that automation increases productivity—the statistics speak for themselves. But are the savings passed on in such a way as to raise the standards of living of those who work the machines and of the people in general? At the ball-bearing factory, the chairman of the factory trade union committee explained that when new machinery is introduced negotiations automatically take place between trade union and management to fix new work norms, wages and bonuses. Both he and the director admitted, with rueful smiles, that sometimes these negotiations involve a lot of argument and even generate heat, but the eventual settlement is always satisfactory to both parties. With every change, wages rise. At other factories I was told much the same, and the director of the Experimental Research Institute of Metal-cutting Machines gave me the estimate that, over all plants, the workers on automatic lines average 30% to 40% higher wages than those on standard machines.

This accounts for only a part of the increased productivity. The rest—and the greater part—goes to benefit the people as a whole in the form of reduced prices. It was not possible for me to separate the effects of automation from those of other technical advances. But, for instance, at the Stalin Auto Works, where productivity increases 8% to 10% each year, a four-ton lorry, which in 1950 cost £500, now sells for £340 (1950 price 20,000 roubles, now 13,500). Reduction of working hours is also among the future objectives, but no immediate steps are being taken.

The new generation are beginning to refuse to do unskilled routine work. Now that secondary ten-year education is compulsory in the cities, its products want work that will give them a chance to exercise the knowledge and skill they have required. They are not prepared to do jobs that leave them only attendants upon the machine. And so factories that want to attract young people must be prepared to give them automatic machines to play with—machines to which they stand in the relation of skilled engineers rather than manual operators. This is to me a most significant development, for I look on automation not merely as a way of producing more with less effort, but also as a

means of making work itself more interesting and creative. It leads on naturally to the fourth main reason that was given to me.

*Automation helps to end the division between mental and manual labour—*for the worker caring for a highly automatic machine uses his brain to decide what must be done, far more than his hands in the doing. And the healing of this 5,000-year-old rift in society is one of the declared objects of socialism.

I also discussed two problems that seriously worry many British workers when they think of automation—the problems of employment and re-training. Will automation, with its vast labour-saving potentialities, bring technological unemployment? The answers I received were again unanimous—in the USSR they have no fear of unemployment; their factories are constantly working to full capacity; production is constantly expanding and they can always use more hands than they can obtain; the release of labour by automation will simply mean that some other sector of the economy can be expanded more rapidly. This state of full employment, they maintain, is a natural consequence of a socialist economy which, by its very nature, cannot create unemployment.

The second worry is this—even assuming that alternative jobs are always available, they will tend to be jobs requiring new skills. Automation has little use for unskilled or even semi-skilled operators. Will automation thus leave many workers stranded for lack of the skills that the new technology demands? Or will adequate measures be taken to retrain them? In the Soviet Union the solution to this problem is part of the normal factory organisation. Every large factory has its own free evening technical school (which is usually only one of several educational institutions attached to the works). Here workers can learn any new skills required. The students are worked very hard; twelve hours a week in evening classes is usual. But they get additional holidays to prepare for and sit their examinations. The amount of this extra leave varies with the course taken—anything from ten to twenty-eight days in addition to the normal twenty-eight. The Stalin Works technical school handles 1,000 students each year. All the present shop managers of the ball-bearing factory are former rank-and-file workers who studied further.

At the Experimental Research Institute of Metal-cutting Machines, plans for the future lay heavy emphasis on *mass-producing* automated machinery. Hitherto such work has been done to order, but that will not cope with future needs. However, only large factories can make full use of automation (at its present stage of development), and so they are concentrating on the production of *unit machines*, so designed that they can be used as single machines of standard type (either manually controlled or as self-contained automatics) or alternatively can be linked by transfer units to make fully automatic lines. They have 300 designers on this work alone.

In the Stankokonstruktsiya Machine-tool Building Factory, which works in close co-operation with the Institute, I saw a number of these unit machines in construction or under test: both centred and centreless grinders (with automatic stops); a powerful broach; a set of four units for machining gear wheels, including the actual gear-cutting; a machine which measures the lack of balance in armature shafts and automatically corrects it by drilling out some metal (for incorporation in the automatic armature shaft lines described above). At this factory and the nearby Ordzhonikidze Machine-tool Building Plant, they plan to produce in the second half of 1955 four times as much automated machinery as they did in the whole of 1954.



PROBLEMS AND ACHIEVEMENTS OF SOVIET HISTORICAL SCIENCE

A. L. Sidorov

*Abridged from the brief survey presented
to the International Congress in Rome
by Academician Sidorov in September 1955*

SOVIET HISTORIOGRAPHY continues the materialist tradition which has found its fullest expression in Marxism. Soviet historians are guided in their work by the method of historical materialism. The break with the theoretical and methodological postulates of bourgeois historiography does not, however, imply that we reject the scientific acquisitions of the past. There is nothing in Marxism resembling "sectarianism", in the sense of its being a hidebound, petrified doctrine.

While critically examining the heritage of pre-revolutionary historiography, Soviet historians by no means jettison the findings of its specific investigations, any more than they discard the valuable factual results of the investigations of contemporary foreign authors adhering to a different methodology.

The development of Soviet historical science has involved a struggle against two dangers. The one is mere empiricism, a skimming over the surface of the facts, a rejection of broad scientific generalisation. There is, of course, a trend in sociology which denies even the possibility of "generalising" individual and allegedly "non-recurring" historical phenomena, or of going beyond a mere description of the facts. Without generalisation, however, there can be no science. What runs through all the theories that deny the possibility of knowing the laws of social development is a fear of the future, an endeavour to halt the march of history, to retard social progress. For this reason, as far back as the nineteen-twenties Soviet historians had unanimously rejected the neo-Kantian methodology of history (W. Windelband, H. Rickert, G. Simmel, M. Weber, B. Croce, *et al.*), expounded in Russia by A. S. Lappo-Danilevsky, D. M. Petrushevsky and other historians.

The other danger is abstract "sociologisation", the replacement of specific material by concocted scholastic "tabulations", of which M. N. Pokrovsky and his disciples were particularly guilty in their day.

Marxist historical science by no means ignores the great complexity of the social, political and spiritual life of society. Soviet historians make an extensive study of the history of the state and other political institutions, of international relations and foreign policy, of social ideas and culture. We proceed, however, from the fact that the relations of production, the economic system of society expressed in its class structure, are the real foundation upon which rises the political and ideological "superstructure". For this reason, all our general historical investigations begin with a study of the material life of society. At the same time, we take into account the reaction of political and ideological processes on the conditions of material life which generated them, for ideas and political institutions are a great and active force accelerating or retarding the course of history.

The founders of historical materialism constantly stressed the fact that the objective laws of historical development do not operate by themselves, as a sort of "fate" dominating mankind. In contrast to the laws of nature, social laws operate through the activity of men, classes, the common people, who are the real creators of history. Such past events as the anti-feudal movements and peasant revolts in the Middle Ages, the early bourgeois revolutions and

the righteous wars for independence of foreign rule are a graphic demonstration that history cannot be reduced to a mere narrative of the activities of conquerors, kings and generals, and that its decisive force and real shapers are the common people.

The leading representatives of nineteenth-century bourgeois historiography recognised the role of the people, though with many reservations, restricting it as a rule to spontaneous brief "incursions" into history. Thus Mignet asserted in his *History of the French Revolution* that "the lower class were well able to act and to govern in time of crisis, but could not do so permanently".

A great step forward in treating the role of the people in history was made by Belinsky, Herzen, Chernyshevsky and Dobrolyubov, the Russian nineteenth-century thinkers, who associated the revolutionary ideas they propagated with the struggle of the peasantry.

Only historical materialism, however, has proved able to give a comprehensive scientific solution to the problem. The changing position of the working people, the growing number of people actively and consciously taking part in the life of society, is the most important aspect of historical progress, in the view of materialist historians. Hence the attention devoted by Soviet historians to the history of the producers of material values; to the role of the working people in creating the material basis of civilisation; to the native roots of the spiritual culture of different epochs; and lastly to the struggle of the working people against oppression in any and every form.

The materialist method has removed historical knowledge from the sphere of subjective definitions and hypotheses, and has laid the foundations for transforming history into an objective and exact science.

We regard world history as one in its vast complexity, underlying which are the successive changes in socio-economic formations—primitive-communal society, slavery, feudalism, capitalism, socialism—each determined by its dominant mode of production of material values. These formations, supplanting one another, constitute the principal stages in the progressive development of human society. All mankind as a whole passes through them, with greater or smaller variations.

Soviet historians also take into account the uneven development of various countries and peoples. The typical phenomenon is not the only one. As a rule, different modes of production co-exist in each of the great historical epochs. It was so in antiquity; when in Rome the slave system existed, in China the transition to feudalism had already taken place, while a large part of mankind was still in the primitive-communal stage. It was so in the Middle Ages also, when the feudal mode of production was not all-embracing, and the population of whole continents (Africa, America, Australia) still lived under the slave system or the primitive-communal order. Many social forms existed in modern times also, when along with the unquestionably dominant rule of capitalism in most European countries there remained more or less substantial survivals of feudalism. Lastly, we ourselves now live in an epoch in which two socio-economic formations, capitalism and socialism, exist side by side. The co-existence of the two systems determines the character and direction of the development of the modern world and all its peoples, including those who are still living not merely in pre-socialist but even in pre-capitalist conditions.

To show each world historical epoch in all its complexity and multiformity, in the contradictory intertwining of the new with the old, is a tremendous and as yet far from completed task. The struggle of the growing new with the obsolescent old constitutes the chief content of great historical epochs, and determines their essence. For this reason, while preserving the generally accepted division of world history into antiquity, the middle ages, modern times and recent times, we set chronological boundaries to these periods which reflect their transition to a new and higher mode of production, or mark the

transition to a new stage of development within the framework of the same social formation.

Soviet historians consider the boundary between ancient and medieval history to be the fall of the Roman Empire owing to popular anti-slavery movements and to the onslaughts of the Germanic and Slavic tribes. Modern history opens with the early bourgeois revolutions in Europe in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. And finally the history of recent times dates from the 1917 revolution, which caused very profound changes not only in Russia but throughout the world.

Such, in broad outline, is the periodic division of history applied in our scientific works and in secondary-school and college textbooks, including the *World History*, a ten-volume collective work now in preparation, covering the history of human society from its earliest stages to the present day. The first two volumes, on antiquity, are expected to appear this year. (Of the other eight volumes, two are on medieval history, three on the history of modern times, 1640—1917, and three on the history of recent times, 1917—1945.)

Soviet historians try to show the historical role of all peoples, great and small. In our concept, the *unity* of the world-historical process necessarily includes the multiplicity of historical forms and ways of social development connected with the specific conditions in different countries and peoples. At the same time, we attach serious importance to the study of the manifold inter-connections between peoples which arose long since in antiquity and gradually expanded and branched out in the course of history, as the social division of labour developed, the world market evolved, and world science and culture progressed.

The creation of broad generalising works is preceded by detailed elaboration of particular historical aspects, in separate monographs and essays. Much is done to develop archæology and auxiliary subjects (archæography, palæography, diplomatics, epigraphy, numismatics, etc.). We also make considerable use of economic statistics, statutes and other legislative materials, data from linguistics and other allied social sciences, including the history of technology, of the natural and technical sciences and of the arts.

Soviet archæology has made great progress. It has advanced far beyond a mere "science of relics" and has become an independent branch of historical knowledge. Study of the remains and monuments of material culture (tools, settlements, etc.) plays a particularly important role in learning the character of the social system of those early societies of which no written sources have survived.

We make considerable use of pre-revolutionary documentary publications, and watch eagerly for new publications on the results of archæological investigations abroad. At the same time, Soviet historians circulate their new materials in all branches of history as widely as possible. The centralisation of archives in the hands of the State, and the great work done in classifying them, has created favourable conditions for research workers and for publishing still unknown or little-known documentary materials.

Our history research personnel has grown in number and quality. We have built up a large network of scientific research establishments, institutes and museums. Instruction in historical subjects, which plays a large part in general secondary and college education, has considerably expanded. An important achievement by our historians is the issue of a number of new secondary-school and college textbooks, which are not only used by students but are read by many of the general public. In 1947-54 alone, eight new college textbooks on history were published, in editions totalling 1,775,000 copies.

New textbooks for elementary and secondary schools on the history of the USSR, of antiquity, of the Middle Ages and of modern times have been published in Russian since the war, in editions totalling 87,500,000 copies. Soviet

history textbooks give the principal facts and processes in Soviet and world history and propagate ideas of friendship among nations and respect for the distinctive national features of the history of other peoples.

Our universities and institutes have 296 chairs of history. Staffs total about 3,000. In addition to teaching, this great army of historians also carries out research.

We also have an extensive network of special scientific institutions working in the fields of history, ethnography, archaeology and the history of the arts. A number of history institutes and establishments make up the Historical Sciences Division of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR. (The Historical Sciences Division comprises the Institute of History, the Institute of Oriental Studies, the Institute of Slav Studies, the Institute of the History of Material Culture, the Institute of Ethnography, the Institute of the History of the Arts, the Museum of the History of Religion and the Archives of the USSR Academy of Sciences.)

The Academy of Sciences in each Union Republic usually has several large scientific history institutions. Thus the Ukraine has five, Estonia four, Uzbekistan three, and so on. All the Autonomous Republics have combined history-archaeology-ethnography institutes.

We regard it as a remarkable result of the cultural revolution in our country that scientific historians have been produced from among the formerly oppressed peoples. Works on history are now published in the languages of all the peoples in the USSR, by historians of all the nationalities in the Union. General histories have recently been compiled by the collective efforts of scholars in the Ukraine, Byelorussia, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Moldavia, Georgia, Armenia, Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, Tadzhikistan, Buryat-Mongolia, Yakutia, and so on; many of these peoples were scorned by bourgeois ethnography as "peoples with no history".

Creative collaboration between Russian historians and their colleagues from the other fraternal peoples of the USSR is developing successfully. We frequently hold joint scientific conferences to discuss complex unsolved problems concerning individual peoples and problems common to the history of the whole country. In recent years such meetings have been held in Tashkent, Baku, Riga, Tallinn, Vilnius, Minsk and centres in other Soviet republics.

A distinctive feature of Soviet historiography is the combination of individual and collective investigation. Examples of large collective works are *Studies in the History of the USSR* (seven volumes), *History of Moscow* (six volumes), *Studies in the History of Leningrad* (three volumes), *History of Historical Science in the USSR* (three volumes), and the *World History* (ten volumes), to name only a few. Every such collective production is a synthesis of the work of a large group of research workers, including historians from the non-Russian republics. Our collective works are unified by a common design, a common world outlook and scientific approach, developed through creative collaboration and through the scientific disputes and discussions which are an integral part of the life of all our institutions and chairs of history. The discussions make it possible for the various viewpoints on as yet unsolved problems to be brought out to the full and for positive solutions to these to be hastened, and they help to obviate one-sided and erroneous views on the part of individual scholars. They are also conducive to the theoretical and scientific growth of all Soviet historians, and in particular of our young research workers. Our discussions are open and public. They are also conducted in our journals, thus promoting historians' intercourse among themselves as well as with their colleagues abroad. (See, for instance, the letter from the British historian G. Thomson, in *Vestnik Drevnei Istorii*, No. 4, 1953.*)

* See *Soviet History Information Bulletin*, Vol. 1, Nos. 3/4, and Vol. 2, No. 1.

The monthly journal of the Institute of History, *Voprosy Istorii* (Problems of History), has conducted* several discussions in the last few years on the periodisation of the history of Russia,* on the genesis of capitalism in Russia, and on the basic economic law of feudal society, to mention only a few. At the same time it reports discussions going on in the historical institutions of the USSR and in other countries.

Besides this central journal, we also have periodicals on special spheres of historical knowledge: *Vestnik Drevnei Istorii* (Journal of Ancient History), *Istoricheskiye Zapiski* (Historical Records), *Sovetskoye Vostokovedeniye* (Soviet Oriental Studies), *Sovetskaya Arkheologiya* (Soviet Archaeology), *Sovetskaya Etnografiya* (Soviet Ethnography), *Prepodavaniye Istorii v Shkole* (Teaching History in School). We have resumed publication of *Istoricheski Arkhiv* (Historical Archives), a bi-monthly. In addition, the Institute of History and other Academy of Sciences Institutes issue *Doklady i Soobshcheniya* (Proceedings and Transactions), symposia such as *Sredniye Veka* (The Middle Ages), *Vizantiiski Vremennik* (Byzantine Annals), and so on. The history departments of universities and training colleges, and the research institutes of the various republics, publish symposia and papers regularly.

In a general paper it is not possible to give any fairly detailed account of the results of our scholars' researches in various branches of historical knowledge. I shall therefore touch on only a few of the problems on which Soviet historians have been working recently.

These include the problem of the formation of class society, the transition from the primitive community to the slave system. Noteworthy, too, are the investigations on the struggle of the oppressed against the slave-owners, and its significance in the history of ancient society; the historical role of Hellenism; the question of the crisis of the Roman Republic and the establishment of the Empire; the socio-economic characteristics of the provinces of the Roman Empire and of early Christianity; and so on.

In elaborating the genesis of feudalism, Soviet historians continue the traditions of pre-revolutionary Russian medieval studies, which devoted primary attention to the agrarian system of the Middle Ages. Historians of feudal society have at their disposal a wealth of documentary material, particularly on the histories of several of the peoples of the USSR. We have studied feudal relations among the peoples of the Orient both on the territory of the USSR and outside its borders.

Soviet historians also devote considerable attention to the medieval city as an economic and cultural centre, with the development of which is associated the appearance of capitalist relations and the rise of humanism.

Soviet Byzantinology, too, concentrates on problems of social and economic development and popular movements. The study of the history of the Slav peoples and their mutual relations in the past has developed considerably in recent years, especially since the opening of the Institute of Slavonic Studies, under the USSR Academy of Sciences.

Continuing the progressive traditions of the Russian oriental school, Soviet investigators have produced a number of works on the socio-economic, political and cultural history of the Orient. They have given a new interpretation of the problems of the development of feudal relations and states in the Orient and the peculiarities of the crisis of feudalism in oriental countries.

Soviet historians have investigated the genesis and evolution of the ancient Russian state. They have authentically proved that the so-called "Norman theory", that the state in Rus was formed as a result of the "invitation" of the Varangians, is contrary to historical fact. Soviet historical science has conclusively proved that the ancient Russian state arose from the dissolu-

* See ANGLO-SOVIET JOURNAL, Vol. XII, No. 4.

tion of the primitive communal order and the formation of a class society among the eastern Slavs, and that their first state formations appeared long before the second half of the ninth century, when the Varangians are alleged to have been invited. By the time of the formation of the Kiev state, agriculture was their principal occupation, and feudal-type land-ownership was already being evolved.

In connection with the study of the feudal nature of the relations of production in Kiev Rus, Soviet historians investigate all aspects of its socio-economic, political and cultural history. Special mention should here be given to B. A. Rybakov's comprehensive study *The Crafts in Ancient Rus* (1948), where a detailed analysis of the technique of artisan production, which attained a high level in Rus, is combined with a social analysis and characterisation of the craftsmen's social position. Academician M. N. Tikhomirov, in his original study *Ancient Russian Cities* (1946), gave a new solution to the problem of the rise and development of cities in eastern Europe, analysed the class composition of the city population, and established the role of the cities in the country's social and political life.

Archaeological investigations are being systematically conducted in a number of ancient Russian cities (Kiev, Novgorod, Chernigov, Staraya Ryazan, Ladoga, Moscow, and others). A vivid example of newly discovered material is the collection of birch-bark scrolls discovered and described by A. V. Artsikhovsky.

The further development of feudalism after the disintegration of the Kiev state has not been studied to the same extent in all its stages. Thus the socio-economic history of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, for example, has been little investigated, while the history of the peasantry and of popular movements in the medieval city of the fifteenth to seventeenth centuries has been elaborated in greater detail.

While regarding socio-economic relations as a major factor in social development, Soviet historians by no means underestimate the role of political institutions and that of the state, which expresses the interests of the ruling classes in a given society.

Thus in studying the problems of the formation of the centralised absolutist feudal state, Soviet investigators note the distinctive features of this process in Eastern Europe and particularly in Russia. Soviet historical science has revealed the economic and social foundations of the origin of the Russian centralised state, and has shown that the requirements of defence, and the struggle with foreign enemies, were factors which merely accelerated the process.

In investigating the turbulent reign of Ivan IV ("Ivan the Terrible"), Soviet historians have revealed the role of the petty nobility and the cities (*posads*) upon whom the tsarist power relied in its struggle with the *boyars*, who were the chief exponents of feudal decentralisation, and have demonstrated the consolidation of the Russian state and its successes in foreign affairs, especially in the East.

Soviet historians have made a notable contribution to the study of the history of Russia under Peter I ("Peter the Great"). Our economists and historians have refuted the concept of an artificial implantation of large-scale industry in Russia by Peter, and have shown the internal prerequisites of the economic transformations at this time.

In recent years the attention of our historians has been attracted by the complex and as yet insufficiently elaborated problem of the disintegration and crisis of feudalism in Russia. Why did the feudal system survive here up to the middle of the nineteenth century? How, chronologically, did the new capitalist relations mature within feudal society? What were the distinctive features of this process? When did the industrial revolution begin and reach

its peak in Russia? These and a number of other questions evoke lively discussion, take up considerable space in the pages of our scientific journals, and are reflected in scientific degree theses.

It is now generally recognised that as early as the seventeenth century a new period began in the history of Russia, characterised by the growth of commodity production in agriculture and the crafts, the rise and development of manufactories, and the gradual evolution of an all-Russian market. Detailed investigations based on data of various estates and manufactories, and on the study of this process in various parts of the country, provide a good foundation for broader generalisations.

There are two main viewpoints among Soviet historians on the beginning, tempo and consummation of the industrial revolution in Russia. Academician S. G. Strumilin and others hold that it was completed even before the reform of 1861. Most of our historians, however, date the completion of the process from after the reform, in the eighties and nineties of last century, assuming that in the first half of the nineteenth century the process had merely made a start and was greatly impeded by the serf system as a whole, without the abolition of which the really rapid and multiform progress of the productive forces was impossible.

Historians, philosophers and literary scholars are carefully studying the ideological and scientific heritage of the great revolutionary democrats Belinsky, Herzen, Chernyshevsky and Dobrolyubov. These studies disclose the immense influence of their ideas and their tremendous contribution to the development of Russian literature, æsthetics, philosophy, political economy, history, and so on.

We consider the chief content of the history of modern times to be the triumph and consolidation of capitalism in Europe and in America, and the transition from "free"-competition capitalism to monopoly capitalism and imperialism.

Two great stages in the development of bourgeois society emerge here. The first stage, covering more than two centuries, is regarded as the ascending curve of the development of capitalism; this is the epoch of the early bourgeois-democratic revolutions in Europe and America, of national-liberation movements and wars, which resulted in an immense upsurge of the productive forces as compared with the past. The rise of bourgeois parliamentary institutions on the ruins of the feudal absolutist regimes, the creation and consolidation of many sovereign national states—such are the progressive political results of that epoch. The old class antagonism between landlords and peasants is superseded by that between the bourgeoisie, which has gained power, and the rapidly growing proletariat.

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries capitalism enters a new stage. The sharpening of the whole sum-total of social and political contradictions, the growth of the class struggle of the proletariat and the labouring masses, the awakening of the Asian peoples to a national liberation struggle—these are the major factors in the world history of this epoch.

Appreciation of the profound all-European significance of the bourgeois revolutions in the West has found expression in a number of works, both individual and collective, by Soviet historians. Collective works on the history of the English revolution in the seventeenth century, the French revolution in the eighteenth century, and the revolutions of 1848-9, generalise the results of earlier work by Soviet scholars.

The great French revolution of 1789-94 is being particularly widely studied by our historians, full consideration being given to the achievements of French historiography, both past and contemporary.

On the occasion of the centenary of the 1848-9 revolutions, a number of works were written by our historians, treating their course in the Slav countries and their influence in Russian from a new angle.

Soviet scholars take a great interest in the study of the history of socialist ideas. Academician Volgin, for example, has for many years been carrying out research in this field. In his works he has analysed the ideological heritage of the leading representatives of Utopian socialism, primarily the French and the English.

Many investigations are devoted to the rise of Marxism and the activities of its founders, Marx and Engels. These works show that there is a direct link between Marxism and the entire preceding development of advanced social thought—such outstanding achievements as German classical philosophy of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, English political economy of the Adam Smith and David Ricardo school, and French Utopian socialism. Marxism, however, does not merely continue the ideas of its predecessors. It is a qualitatively new stage in the progress of social knowledge.

The study of the Paris Commune of 1871 has a prominent place in Soviet historiography. Among the general works on the Commune, I. I. Stepanov-Skvortsov's absorbing book *The Paris Commune* and P. M. Kerzhentsev's monograph *History of the Paris Commune of 1871* deserve special mention.

After the Paris Commune, a new period in the history of the labour movement began, characterised by the extensive spreading of Marx's teaching and the appearance of mass social-democratic parties.

One of the main problems on which Soviet historians are working is that of the formation of the proletariat and the development of the labour movement in Russia. This work is being carried on by a group of researchers and archivists headed by Academician Pankratova. A large series of documents on the history of the labour movement in the nineteenth century was published in 1951—2.

Numerous collections of documents throw light on the history of the 1905-7 revolution. Soviet historians have studied the year 1905, the period of the onset of the revolution—the mounting strike struggle, the creation of Soviets of Workers' Deputies, the peasant movement, the ferment in the army and navy, the armed rising in Moscow and other working-class centres—with great thoroughness. The struggle in the non-Russian parts of the country has also been extensively investigated. A collective work, *The 1905-7 Revolution in the Non-Russian Areas*, has already gone into a second edition. Soviet historians have, in conjunction with progressive colleagues in other countries, prepared a large collective work on the international significance of the 1905-7 revolution.

The history of international relations, diplomacy and wars is a major branch of current Soviet historiography. A three-volume *History of Diplomacy*, edited by the late Academician V. P. Potemkin, was published in the USSR in 1941-5. This deals with international relations from ancient times down to World War II. Although not without shortcomings, this work is still of value.

The history of the Russo-Turkish wars in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, of the Crimean War, and of other wars, has been comprehensively studied and richly documented in a number of Soviet works.

Three tasks of immense importance confront Soviet historians of recent times: first, that of studying the history of the great Russian revolution, and of showing it as a law-governed phenomenon prepared by the whole course of the preceding historical development of Russia and of the world capitalist system as a whole; secondly, that of generalising the results of socialist transformation in the spheres of economy, culture and the building-up of the multinational Soviet State; thirdly, that of showing the international influence of the revolution, the aggravation of the crisis of modern capitalism, the position of the labour movement in the capitalist countries and of the national-liberation movement in the colonial and dependent countries.

From the very first days after the revolution, work was started on the

organisation and accumulation of archive materials on the history of Soviet society. Special archives were instituted, in which are preserved the materials of all central and local administrative organs, departments and institutions. The largest of these archives are the Central State Archive of the October Revolution and of Socialist Construction, and the Central State Archive of the Soviet Army. In addition, there are local archives in every city and region. Much, though still far from enough, has been done in publishing archive documents.

The history of socialist construction in the USSR, and of the profound economic changes that have been effected, is being extensively studied. Documents and investigations are published showing the historical results of the socialist industrialisation policy, and the decisive role of modern heavy industry and machine-building in the reconstruction of the country's whole national economy.

The solution of the national problem, the creation and consolidation of the multi-national State, the development of friendship between the peoples, and their socialist mutual aid in the process of economic and cultural construction, form another group of questions treated in a number of works by Soviet scholars on the basis of studying and generalising concrete historical material.

We consider that in studying current history it is important to focus attention not on superficial, incidental, transient events and facts, but on the deep fundamental processes which determine the course of social development.

It is on this firm and unshakable foundation that our historians raise and elaborate the basic problems of recent times. Soviet historians pay great attention to the study of the disintegration of the colonial system, the mass movement against colonialism, and the establishment of sovereign states in Asia which have taken or are taking the road of independent development.



We have dwelt on a number of historical problems, by no means exhausting them, and merely citing investigations and publications characteristic of the general development of Soviet historiography. These give a certain idea both of the method of our work and of some of its results. In spite of our achievements in a number of historiographical fields, we fully realise that there are still many unsolved problems, and we are aware of the difficulties historical science has to overcome in tackling its complex tasks. Soviet historians consider it their prime duty to extend their work on the history of Soviet society as well as on the history of recent times in the people's democracies, in the capitalist countries and in the non-Soviet East.

We believe that differences of view on the tasks of historical research, on method, and on the evaluation of various phenomena of the past, need be no obstacle to scientific collaboration, to the exchange of ideas and experience between scholars from different countries, to strengthening the spirit of collaboration between Soviet scholars and their colleagues in western Europe, Asia, America and Africa. We are hopeful that this congress will strengthen relations between historians in different countries and will encourage scientific research in every branch of history.

See separate bibliography of Soviet works mentioned by Academician Sidorov.

Bibliography

of Soviet works mentioned by Academician Sidorov

in his address to the International Congress of Historians
in Rome, September 1955

(Works marked * are available in the
SCR Library.)

- Lyashchenko, P. I. **History of the National Economy of the USSR.***
- Tikhomirov, M. N. and Dmitryev, S. S. **A History of the USSR.***
- Shestakov, A. V. (Ed.) **A History of the USSR.**
- Mishulin, A. V. (Ed.) **A History of Antiquity.**
- Kovalev, S. I. (Ed.) **A History of Antiquity.**
- Kosminsky, E. A. (Ed.) **A History of the Middle Ages.***
- Yefimov, A. V. (Ed.) **A History of Modern Times, Part I.***
- Khvostov, V. M. (Ed.) **A History of Modern Times, Part II.**
- Pankratova, A. M. (Ed.) **A History of the USSR.***
- Struve, V. V. **The Problem of the Rise, Development and Decline of Slave Societies in the Ancient East.**
- Nikolsky, N. M. **Private Land Ownership and Land Tenure in Ancient Mesopotamia.**
- Dyakonov, I. M. **Development of Land Relations in Assyria.**
- Laws of the Babylonian, Assyrian and Hittite Kingdoms.
- Avdiyev, V. I. **A History of the Ancient Orient.**
- Riftin, A. P. **Old Babylonian Legal and Administrative Documents in USSR Collections.**
- Piotrovsky, B. B. **History and Culture of Urartu.***
- Karmir-Blur.
- Melikishvili, G. A. **Nairi Urartu.**
- Tolstov, S. P. **Ancient Khoresm.***
- On the Trail of the Ancient Khoresmian Civilisation.**
- Masson, M. E., and Dyakonov, M. M. and I. M. **Parthian Tax Documents of the 2nd Century B.C. found at Nisa.**
- Zhebelev, S. A. **The North Black Sea Region.***
- Blavatsky, V. D. **Agriculture in the Ancient States of the North Black Sea Region.**
- Zograf, A. N. **Ancient Coins.**
- Gaidukevich, V. F. **The Bosporean Kingdom.**
- Knipovich, T. N. **Tanais.**
- Belov, G. D. **Khersones Tauri.**
- Kallistov, D. P. **Studies in the History of the North Black Sea Region in Antiquity.**
- Mishulin, A. V. **Spartacus.**
- Ancient Spain prior to the Establishment of the Roman Provincial System in 197 B.C.**
- Mashkin, N. A. **The Principate of Augustus.**
- Utchenko, S. L. **Ideological and Political Struggle in Rome on the Eve of the Fall of the Republic.**
- Ranovich, A. B. **Hellenism and its Historical Role.**
- The Eastern Provinces of the Roman Empire in the 1st-3rd Centuries.**
- Kudryavtsev, O. V. **Hellenic Provinces in the Balkan Peninsula in the 2nd Century A.D.**
- Vipper, R. Y. **Early Christian Literature. Rome and Early Christianity.**
- Neusykhin, A. I. **The Appearance of the Dependent Peasant Class in the Early Feudal States of Western Europe.**
- Udaltsov, A. D. **From the Agrarian History of Carolingian Flanders.**
- Gratsiansky, N. P. **The Burgundian Village in the 10th-12th Centuries.**
- Kosminsky, E. A. **The English Village in the 13th Century.**
- Studies in the Agrarian History of England in the 13th Century.***
- Stoklitskaya-Tereshkovich, V. V. **Essays on the Social History of German Cities in the 14th-15th Centuries.**
- Rutenberg, V. I. **Essay on the History of Early Capitalism in Italy, The Florentine Companies of the 14th Century.**
- Sidorova, N. A. **Essays on the History of Early Urban Culture in France.**
- Smirin, M. M. **Thomas Munzer; Popular Reformation and the Great Peasant War.**
- Essays on the History of the Political Struggle in Germany prior to the Reformation.**
- Semyonov, V. F. **Enclosures and Peasant Movements in England in the 16th Century.**
- Porshnev, B. F. **People's Risings in France in the Years before the Fronde.***
- Pigulevskaya, N. V. **Byzantium and Irani in the late 6th and early 7th Centuries.**
- Byzantium on the Route to India: From the History of Byzantine Trade with the East in the 4th-6th Centuries.**
- Levchenko, M. V. **A Short History of Byzantium.**
- Lazarev, V. N. **A History of Byzantine Painting.***
- Grekov, B. D. **The Vinodol Statute on the Social and Political Conditions in Vinodol.**
- Poliza: A Study in Social Relations in Poliza in the 15th-17th Centuries.***
- Derzhavin, N. S. **A History of Bulgaria.***
- Picheta, V. I. (Ed.) **A History of the Czechia.**
- Tikhomirov, M. N. **Historical Ties of the Russian People with the South Slavs from Ancient Times to the first half of the 17th Century.**

- Krachkovsky, I. Y. **Studying Arab Manuscripts.**
- Konrad, N. I. **Sung Tsi Treatise on Military Art.**
- Zahoder, B. N. **The Middle Ages in the Orient: the Caliphate and Near East.**
- Antonova, K. A. **Studies in the Social Relations and Political System in Mogul India at the time of Akbar (1556-1605).**
- Reisner, M. M. **The Development of Feudalism and the Rise of the State of the Afghans.**
- Gordlevsky, V. A. **The Seldzhukian State in Asia Minor.**
- Miller, A. F. **Mustafa Pasha Bairaktar: The Ottoman Empire in the Early 19th Century.***
- Grekov, B. D. **The Struggle of Rus for the Creation of its State.***
- Yushkov, S. V. **Studies in the History of Feudalism in Kiev Rus. The Social, Political and Legal System of the Kiev State. A History of the State and Law of the USSR.**
- Grekov, B. D. **Slavery and Feudalism in Ancient Rus. Kiev Rus (Feudal Relations in the Kiev State).***
- The Peasants in Rus from Ancient Times up to the 17th Century.*
- Rybakov, B. A. **The Crafts in Ancient Rus.***
- Tikhomirov, M. N. **Ancient Russian Cities.**
- Artsikhovskiy, A. V., and Tikhomirov, M. N. **Novgorod Birch-Bark Scrolls.**
- Kafenhaus, B. B. **The Northern War and the Nystad Peace, 1700-21.***
- Peter I and his Time.
- Lystsov, V. P. **Peter I's Persian Campaign, 1722-3.**
- Telpukhovskiy, B. S. **The Northern War of 1700-21. The Generalship of Peter I.**
- Nikiforov, L. A. **Russo-British Relations under Peter I.**
- Tarle, E. V. **The Russian Navy and the Foreign Policy of Peter I.**
- Druzhinin, N. M. **State Peasants and P. D. Kiselev's Reform.**
- Sivkov, K. V. **Studies in the History of Serf Economy and the Peasant Movements in Russia in the First Half of the 19th Century.**
- Strumilin, S. G. **A History of the Iron and Steel Industry of Russia. Vol. I.**
- Zaozerskaya, E. I. **Manufactures under Peter I. The Development of Light Industry in Moscow in the First Quarter of the 18th Century.**
- Pavlenko, N. I. **The Development of the Metallurgical Industry in Russia in the First Half of the 18th Century.**
- Lyubomirov, P. G. **Studies in the History of Russian Industry in the 17th, 18th and Early 19th Centuries.**
- Baburin, D. S. **Studies in the History of Manufacture.**
- Kafenhaus, B. B. **A History of the Demidov Enterprises in the 18th-19th Centuries.**
- Smirnov, I. I. **The Bolotnikov Rising of 1606-7.***
- Ignatovich, I. I. **The Peasant Movement in the Don Valley in 1820.**
- Linkov, Y. I. **The Peasant Movement in Russia during the Crimean War of 1853-6. Studies in the History of the Peasant Movement in Russia 1825-61.**
- Nochkina, M. V. **The Rising of December 14, 1825.**
- Pazhitnov, K. A. **The Economic Views of the Decembrists.**
- Aksyonov, K. **The Decembrists' Northern Society.**
- Prokofyev, E. A. **The Struggle of the Decembrists for Advanced Russian Military Art.**
- Nechayeva, V. S. **V. G. Belinsky: Early Life and Beginning of Literary Work. V. G. Belinsky: University Years.**
- Polyakov, M. **Belinsky at Moscow University. Belinsky in Moscow.**
- Illeritsky, V. E. **Belinsky's Historical Views.**
- Elsberg, Y. E. **A. I. Herzen.***
- Filatova, E. M. **Economic Views of Herzen and Ogarev.**
- Belyavskaya, I. M. **Herzen and the Polish National-Liberation Movement in the 1860s.**
- Kruzhkov, V. S. **Dobrolyubov's World Outlook.**
- Rosental, M. **Chernyshevsky's Philosophical Views**
- Makayev, N. **Chernyshevsky as Editor of "Voyenny Sbornik."**
- Chernyshevskaya, N. M. **Chronicle of N. G. Chernyshevsky's Life and Activities.**
- Zevin, V. J. **Chernyshevsky's Political Views and Programme.**
- Smirnov, P. P. **The Townsfolk and their Class Struggle prior to the 17th Century.**
- Serbina, K. N. **Studies in the Social and Economic History of the Russian Cities.**
- Tikhomirov, M. N. **The Pskov Rising of 1650.**
- Basilevich, K. V. **Alexei Mikhailovich's Currency Reform and the Moscow Rising of 1662.**
- Zutis, J. J. **The Ostsee Problem in the 18th Century.**
- Petrushevsky, I. P. **Studies in the History of Feudal Relations in Azerbaïdzhān and Armenia in the 16th and early 19th centuries.**
- Basilevich, K. V. **The Foreign Policy of the Russian Centralised State in the Second Half of the 15th Century. Studies in the History of the USSR, Feudal Period, 9th-15th Centuries. Part II.**
- Cherepnin, L. V. **Russian Feudal Archives of the 14th and 15th Centuries.**
- Bakhrushin, S. V. **Ivan the Terrible.**
- Smirnov, I. I. **Ivan the Terrible.**
- Vipper, R. Y. **Ivan the Terrible.***
- Sadikov, P. A. **Studies in the History of the Oprichnina.**
- Smirnov, N. A. **Russia and Turkey in the 16th and 17th Centuries.***
- Novoselsky, A. A. **The Struggle of the Moscow State with the Tatars in the early 17th Century.**
- Vainshtein, O. L. **Russia and the Thirty Years War, 1618-48.**

- Arkhangelsky, S. I. **The Agrarian Legislation of the English Revolution.**
- Lavrovsky, V. M. **Parliamentary Enclosure Acts in Engalnd in the late 18th and early 19th Centuries.**
- Tarle, E. V. **The Working Class of France in the Early Period of Machine Production, from the End of the Empire to the Workers' Rising in Lyons, 1815-34.**
- Potemkin, F. V. **The Lyons Risings of 1831 and 1834.**
- Varga, E. S. (Ed.). **World Economic Crises, 1848-1935.**
- Mendelson, L. **Economic Crises and Cycles in the 19th Century.**
- Kosminsky, E. A., and Levitsky, A. Y. (Ed.) **The English Bourgeois Revolution of the 17th Century.**
- Volgin, V. P., and Tarle, E. V. (Ed.) **The French Bourgeois Revolution of 1789-94.**
- Potemkin, F. V., and Molok, A. I. (Ed.) **The Revolutions of 1848-9.**
- Volgin, V. P. **Social and Political Ideas in France before the Revolution, 1748-89.** (Ed.) **Voltaire, Articles and Materials.**
- Derzhavin, N. **Voltaire.**
- Tarle, E. V. **Germinal and Prairial.**
- Dobrolyubsky, K. P. **Thermidor: Studies in the History of the Class Struggle in France, 1794-5.**
- Zastenker, N. E. **The 1848 Revolution in France.**
- Kan, S. B. **The 1848 Revolution in Austria and Germany.**
- Nifontov, A. S. **Russia in 1848.**
- Udaltsov, I. I. **Studies in the History of the National-Political Struggle in Czechia in 1848.**
- Volgin, V. P. **Studies in the History of Socialism.**
- Stepanova, E. A. **Friedrich Engels.**
- Kandel, E. P. **Marx and Engels, Organizers of the Communist League.**
- Rosenberg, D. I. **Studies in the Development of the Economic Doctrine of Marx and Engels in the 1840s.**
- Molok, A. I. **The German Intervention Against the Paris Commune.**
- Gindin, I. F. **Russian Commercial Banks.**
- Pogrebinsky, A. P. **Studies in the History of the Finances of Prerevolutionary Russia, 19th-20th Centuries.**
- Shpolyansky, D. I. **Monopolies in the Coal and Metallurgical Industries of Southern Russia in the early 20th Century.**
- Khromov, P. A. **Studies in the Development of the Textile Industry in the USSR.**
- Rashin, A. G. **The Formation of the Industrial Proletariat in Russia.**
- Nesterenko, A. A. **Studies in the History of Industry and the Conditions of the Proletariat in the Ukraine in the Late 19th and Early 20th Centuries.**
- Bystryansky, V. A. (Ed.) **A History of the Putilov Factory.**
- Pazhitmov, K. A. **Studies in the History of the Baku Oil Industry.**
- Badayev, A. **The Bolsheviks in the State Duma.***
- Samoilov, F. N. **Retracing the Past.**
- Mitskevich, S. I. **On the Border of Two Epochs. Revolutionary Moscow.**
- Pankratova, A. M. **The First Russian Revolution.***
- Bogutskaya, L. V. **The Moscow Bolsheviks in the 1905 Strike Battles.**
- Kostomarov, G. D. **The Moscow Soviet of Workers' Deputies in 1905.**
- Galkin, V. A. **The Ivanovo-Voznesensk Bolsheviks in the First Russian Revolution.**
- Vetoshkin, M. K. **Studies in the History of the Bolshevik Organisations and the Revolutionary Movement in Siberia, 1898-1907. The Trans-Baikal Bolsheviks and the Chita Armed Rising of 1905-6.**
- Naida, S. F. **The Revolutionary Movement in the Tsarist Navy, 1825-1917.**
- Krastyn, Y. P. **The 1905-7 Revolution in Latvia.**
- Raimov, R. M. **The Year 1905 in Bashkiria.**
- Korobov, S. A. **The Revolutionary Movement in the Mari Region during the First Bourgeois-Democratic Revolution in Russia, 1905-7.**
- Tarle, E. V. **Napoleon's Invasion of Russia, 1812.***
- Zhilin, L. A. **Kutuzov's Counter-offensive in 1812.**
- Beskovny, L. G. **The Patriotic War of 1812 and Kutuzov's Counter-Offensive.**
- Tarle, E. V. **The Crimean War.***
- Yerusalimsky, A. S. **The Foreign Policy and Diplomacy of German Imperialism at the End of the 19th Century.**
- Manfred, A. Z. **The Foreign Policy of France, 1871-91.**
- Rubinstein, E. I. **The Policy of German Imperialism in Poland's Western Lands in the late 19th and early 20th Centuries.**
- Notovich, F. O. **Diplomatic Struggle in the First World War.**
- Romanov, B. A. **Russia and Manchuria. Studies in the Diplomatic History of the Russo-Japanese War.**
- Zhukov, E. M. **History of Japan.**
- Galperin, A. L. **The Anglo-Japanese Alliance.**
- Avarin, V. Y. **The Struggle for the Pacific.***
- Dobrov, A. **The Far-Eastern Policy of the USA during the Russo-Japanese War.**
- Reisner, I. M., and Rubtsov, B. K. (Ed.) **A Modern History of the Non-Soviet Orient.**
- Yefimov, G. V. **Studies in China's History in Modern and Recent Times.**
- Guber, A. A. **The Philippine Republic of 1898 and American Imperialism.**
- Olderogge, D. A., and Potekhin, I. I. (Ed.) **The Peoples of Africa.**

Pankratova, A. M., Sidorov, A. L. and Chugayev, D. A. (Ed.) **Establishment of Soviet Government in the Localities, 1917-8.**
 Khachapuridze, G. **The Victory of Soviet Government in Georgia.***
 Khaptayev, P. T. **Buryat-Mongolia before and during the 1917 Revolution.**
 Andreyev, A. M. **The Struggle of the Lithuanian People for Soviet Government, 1918-9.**
 Zhitov, K. E. **The Victory of the 1917 Revolution in Uzbekistan.**
 Kuliev, O. **Turkmenistan before and during the 1917 Revolution.**
 Kochetovskaya, E. N. **Land Nationalisation in the USSR.**
 Gladkov, I. A. **Studies in the Building of Soviet Planned Economy, 1917-8.**
Problems of Soviet Economic Planning, 1918-20.
 Genkina, E. B. **The Transition of the Soviet State to the New Economic Policy, 1921-2.**
 Krayev, M. A. **The Victory of the Collective Farm System in the USSR.**
 Genkina, E. B. **The Formation of the USSR.**
 Pesikina, E. I. **The People's Commissariat for the Affairs of the Nationalities and its Activities, 1917-8.**
Studies in the Development of the National Economy in the Ukrainian SSR.

Soviet **HISTORY** ***Information*** **Bulletin**

General Editor : E. Fox

Bulletin Editor : B. Pearce

Each issue 1/6 (post free 1/9)

The Society for Cultural Relations with the USSR

**14 Kensington Square
 London, W.8**

publishes regular

Soviet Information Bulletins

on a variety of subjects

(all at 1/6, or 1/9 post free,
 per issue), and also the

Anglo-Soviet Journal

(at 2/6, or 2/9 post free,
 per issue).

Please send stamped addressed
 envelope for particulars.

Published in Great Britain

Copyright reserved

Printed by Letchworth Printers Ltd. (T.U.), Letchworth, Herts.—F1598/1.5

A VISIT TO A PIONEER CAMP

Tbilisi, Georgia

Janet M. Morell

FOR A TEACHER, to visit the USSR in August is to miss the chance of seeing anything of the schools at work. That this is an irreparable loss is obvious ; anyone who practises an art, skill, craft—whatever you like to call teaching—must always enjoy seeing it practised by someone else. It is the satisfaction peculiar to the professional. Studying the official syllabuses, talking to young men and women in the USSR about their school life, what they learnt and how they were taught, discussing with teachers ; I did all that. But there is nothing except being in school—apart from teaching in it—to give an idea of what the children are like, what is being asked from them, and what is being offered to them. There is the “feel” of the class, the tone of voice, the expression, the very posture, which the experienced teacher automatically gauges in a class-room. The international freemasonry of the professional teacher never ceases to delight me when, as not infrequently happens, foreign visitors come to the classes which I myself teach.

Still, there the children are when it is holiday time, though in the cities, in Moscow and Leningrad in the summer of 1955, one was as little conscious of them as one is when moving about in any great city in the summer holidays ; less conscious, perhaps, than one might be in parts of English cities, if parents are not away and the children are at home from school. What struck us forcibly quite soon was that when we saw children we saw them in groups, with a grown-up in charge. As we drove out to Zagorsk to visit the Troitse-Sergievsky Monastery, from time to time we passed on the road a lorry full of children, chatting, laughing, singing, out for the day. I remember a wide stretch of open country breaking into the forests which marched by the road. There was a little lake in it, and round the lake a number of children were playing, bathing, sitting, and lying about. In one of the villages was a group of wooden buildings, decked with flags and banners. There were children in the grounds round it, and a few grown-ups looking in at them playing. A Pioneer camp, we were told. As we walked about in the Kremlin grounds, and when we visited Stalin's birthplace at Gori, we met parties of children. One fourteen-year-old girl I talked to at the Kremlin was from the Ukraine, she told me, and when she left school she would work on a collective farm. All the children wore the red neckerchief of the Pioneers : all were at one Pioneer camp or another and were making an excursion to the place where we saw them.

We went to one of these camps when we were in Georgia, and paid visits on two successive days. This was about eight miles from Tbilisi, perched on the side of the foothills of the Caucasus. It held 150 boys and girls, or more, and was maintained by the Railwaymen's Union. The road mounted steadily through bare rounded hills, with a few recently built houses near it, looking over a far-stretching, open vista. The camp was unmistakable, a long, two-storeyed building with one or two other buildings close by, trees and gardens round it, and a more or less flat playing space terraced out of the slope. There were the flags, the bunting, the banners ; and as the car turned at the gate, there were the children.

They were lined up, boys on one side of the path, girls on the other. When we were all assembled from the cars we were greeted with *one* hearty cheer. (If there are to be cheers at all, one automatically expects three of them !) Then, as we were presented to the director, came the clapping, the rhythmic slow clap of the USSR. The children dispersed and reassembled along the sides of an open space ; we stood opposite the rostrum which occupied the other end. The

director mounted the platform, and in turn four children, group leaders, came up to him and briefly reported the day's happenings, each concluding with the announcement of the arrival of the English cultural delegation. Another boy made us a short speech, interpreted as welcoming us and inviting us to join them. We were then invested with a red handkerchief each, making us honorary Young Pioneers, and led away by the children, who, formalities over, clustered round and took possession. Our departure was formal also for a moment : an assembly of the children, a few words of thanks and affectionate farewell from us, then a gay send-off. We did not then know that we would be returning next day. When we came then we were once again received by the ranks, who took the time from one of the staff and chorused in English : " How are you ? "

The children ranged in age from six to sixteen, and we saw the pursuits of the older and the younger. There was a volley-ball match, played with vigour, though with what degree of skill I am not competent to say, and I must admit that watching the children who played and those who came round us tended to distract attention from the finer points of the game. We were soon aware of Tamara, a student working in the camp. She is studying English at the Institute in Tbilisi, and once her shyness at speaking at all had vanished she talked English well and understood us well also. Other older girls and boys then ventured their English and all went swimmingly. It may be added that with the small children no difficulties in language existed. We spoke English, they spoke Russian, and communication was established. We went to a courtyard with a covered platform at one end, on which was a piano. A remark about music produced a violin and a cello, part of the camp's equipment. One of the girls was carried off to the piano ; she played a Brahms intermezzo with spirit and technical accomplishment. Another girl, Liana, who instantly held one's attention because she had such a beautiful, serene face, was a violinist, and intends to study music when she leaves school. Then the little ones played a singing game, and as we watched the complicated step we found ourselves dancing too, partnered by a seven-year-old, who led us through the intricacies before returning us to join in clapping out the rhythm. This was followed by another group of seven- or eight-year-old children, who mounted the platform and sang. One of them caught the eye, a little girl obviously hating the publicity of the front row, unable to sing a note as she just managed to keep back tears. I saw her later, as we were going, trying hard to get away from the line of children crowding to see us off, and shaking off the others who were pulling her forward. Then up come an older girl, who warded off the younger children and gently coaxed her into the group with the rest. When we paid a second visit to the children, a chess match was in progress. It was pleasant to sit down and watch the players, fifteen-year-old boys, so engrossed in the game that they did not look up for a moment, and the on-lookers too just as concentrated.

Natural, unselfconscious ease and friendliness are outstanding impressions of the children in the camp. When one of our party gave a conjuring entertainment, the children of all ages were lost to the world in watching, buzzing with comment between the acts, but not during them, though they joined with a will in counting aloud up to ten when asked to do so. Some counted in English, some in Russian ; one noticed a tendency in the English counters to arrive at ten a little prematurely. Spontaneous friendliness and natural ease are, one may say, the engaging qualities of most happy, healthy children. Yet here we all noticed something more. The liveliness and excitement, the gaiety and friendliness, did not spill over to excess. There was no suggestion of repression, however, or of an artificial control. The children in this camp combined with their energy and interest something one can only call gentleness and consideration. The older boys and girls looked after the little ones and took care that

they were placed where they could see the conjuring. When I was talking to a group of boys and girls, they took care to see that I was sitting down comfortably. There was one very small boy, who could not have been more than three—the son of one of the camp workers—who wandered about in a detachedly independent manner. Occasionally one of the older children would pick him up, and as often as not it was a boy who took the child on his knee for a time. One of the visitors passed round photographs of his children. They circulated round some fifty children, and were carefully returned in perfect condition. The children were demonstratively affectionate: they held your hand, put an arm round you, or took your arm, but never overpowered you or showed off for attention. It recalled a visit to a happy family more than anything else. The older ones were very eager to show us their books. When I asked one to read aloud from the English class-book she had with her, I found a large group who were anxious to practise their English and to ask about the writers from whose work they had been reading extracts—Dickens, Hardy, Wells, Shaw, Conrad.

These two visits to the Pioneer camp were devoted to the children. I myself went intending to ask in some detail about organisation and equipment. I did see the sleeping accommodation, as the girls were anxious to show their rooms. As one would expect, it was of the simplest: rooms with three or four beds in a plain, well-scrubbed building, and a few personal possessions such as books on a shelf by the bed. The windows were wide open and the rooms airy and light. We were on the way to the Pioneer room when we paused to look at books and settled down to English until it was time to go. Teachers and students look after the children in the camps, we gathered. The teachers are paid over and above their salary if they undertake this work, and the time they spend from their holiday in working in the camps is made up. Perhaps more time should have been spent in our visit looking at kitchen equipment or inquiring about general organisation. Yet I doubt whether it would have told us nearly as much about a Pioneer camp as it was possible to find out from being among the children. After all, they *are* the camp. Personally, I don't regret having forgotten all about the buildings. I shall always remember the children.

The Pioneer camp near Tbilisi remains sharp and vivid in my mind from a visit to the USSR crammed with new experiences. The children's air of happiness and general well-being, not only there but everywhere we encountered them, was noticeable enough. A visit to a children's camp might well have been no more than a formal affair, with the foreigners mere natural phenomena. It was the sense of being accepted into a community that made the visit a memorable experience. The warmth of the interest aroused by our visit made shyness or reserve impossible. We had our two interpreters with us, but the children were their own interpreters, and eagerness to ask and to tell overcame the barriers of language.

Now more than ever I would like to go into some of the schools in the USSR, to see whether the children, so easy and natural in camp, show the same qualities in the class-room. "Are they always like this?" I asked a young Georgian girl. "Always. Our children are always friendly", was the reply. When I was back home, comparing notes with a headmistress who had visited schools in the USSR in 1934, she had exactly the same comment to make as I on the affectionate gentleness of the children with their visitors and with each other. When we spent an hour or two on the Children's Railway in Tbilisi the same characteristics appeared. The charming warmth and ease of the young men and women we encountered from time to time appear as the natural growth from a childhood where such qualities have an opportunity to strike lasting roots.

THE USSR ACADEMY OF SCIENCES AND ITS SCIENTIFIC LINKS WITH BRITAIN

A. V. Topchiev

Academic Secretary to the USSR Academy of Sciences

HARDLY ANYONE today would deny the importance of international co-operation for the development of science. It is difficult to imagine at what stage of development the human race would be were it not for the close contacts kept up between different nations. For science this is more necessary than in any other field. Would the progress of modern science be possible without the legacy of the past, without the discoveries of Newton and Darwin, Mendeleyev and Pavlov, Curie and Einstein, and other leading representatives of creative thought? Their names are known in all countries, their discoveries belong to all. This is why scholars of all countries seek the development of scientific relations and international co-operation. This trend was made particularly manifest during the International Scientific and Technical Conference at Geneva, on the peaceful uses of atomic energy, attended by scientists of nearly all those countries where work is being done, on a larger or smaller scale, on the problems of utilising for the peaceful development of economic life the colossal energy contained in the atom. At this conference scientists freely exchanged not only their ideas and the results of their research, but also invitations to visit the main scientific centres of research on nuclear energy. It was there that Soviet scientists invited their British colleagues to come to the Soviet Union to acquaint themselves with our achievements in the utilisation of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes.

But it would be wrong to think that relations with British scientists began at the Geneva conference. Scientific relations between our two countries have existed for a long time.

As a chemist, I must mention the outstanding Russian scientist D. Mendeleyev, who was awarded honorary degrees by the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge and was a Fellow of the Royal Society. To him, the discoverer of the periodic system of elements, modern science, which has penetrated the mysteries of the structure of the atom, owes a particular debt.

Academicians I. Vinogradov and P. Kapitsa are also Fellows of the Royal Society. In turn, a number of leading British scientists are Honorary Fellows of the USSR Academy of Sciences, among them the well-known physicists Max Born and Erwin Schroedinger, the biologist J. B. S. Haldane, the mathematician P. Dirac, and others.

Among all the varied forms of co-operation between Soviet and British scientists, the most important are exchanges of visits by scientists, participation in international and national congresses and conferences, the exchange of lecturers, correspondence, and the exchange of scientific publications between scientific institutions as well as between individual scientists.

The most characteristic form of collaboration at the present time is the exchange of visits by scientists. In 1955, at the invitation of the USSR Academy of Sciences, a large group of scientists, headed by J. D. Bernal, professor in the University of London and a well-known physicist and public figure, visited the Soviet Union. The group included specialists in different branches of science: physicists, chemists, biologists and geologists. They spent over three weeks in the Soviet Union and during that time visited the main scientific centres in Moscow, Leningrad and Tbilisi, acquainted themselves with the organisation of scientific work in our country and the basic direction in which research was being carried out, and established personal contacts with leading Soviet scientists. While acquainting themselves with a number of scientific institutions,

the British scientists spoke on the work carried out in England in the corresponding field. Some of them, for instance R. G. M. Norrish, professor in the University of Cambridge, J. D. Bernal, W. R. K. Wynne-Jones, D. R. Newth, and J. R. Harding, gave lectures to crowded audiences. Such visits are of mutual benefit to scientists in both countries.

In the course of the same year the USSR Academy of Sciences welcomed another important group of British specialists in nuclear energy, led by the assistant director of the research centre at Harwell, Dr. B. R. Schoenland, F.R.S.

Unlike other scientific groups to visit our country, this last was more or less uniform in its composition, and the interests of its members were therefore concentrated in one field, the utilisation of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. With this in view, our guests were shown over the first power station in the world operated by nuclear energy. And although most of them were acquainted with this power station from the papers read at the Geneva international conference, as one of them put it: "No papers or lectures can take the place of a personal acquaintance with this remarkable institution."

The group was particularly interested in learning of the experience and methods of exploitation of the atomic power station, because the building of a similar power station in England is soon to be completed.

The visit of this group to our country coincided with the visit to Britain, at the invitation of the Royal Society, of a group of Russian scholars from the USSR Academy of Sciences, headed by its president, Academician A. N. Nesmeyanov. This group spent some three weeks in Britain and acquainted itself with the latest achievements of British scientists in the field of chemistry, mathematics and biology, as well as in technology, visiting the Universities of London, Cambridge, Oxford and Edinburgh.

But this was not the only important result of the visit. A number of questions connected with the furtherance of relations between the main scientific organisations of the Soviet Union and Britain—the USSR Academy of Sciences and the Royal Society—were discussed with the leading members of the Society. On behalf of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Academician Nesmeyanov invited a group of British scientists, headed by the former president of the Royal Society, Lord Adrian, to pay a return visit to the Soviet Union to acquaint themselves with the work of the Academy and of other scientific institutions in our country.

The interchange of groups is an excellent means of establishing the personal contacts between the scientists of our two countries which foster the successful progress of science.

Besides the exchange of scientific groups, an important part in the relations between our scientists and those of other countries is played by their encounters at international and national congresses and conferences. In 1955 alone, Soviet scientists took part in such international congresses and conferences (held in Great Britain) as the Ninth General Assembly of the International Astronomical Union, the International Congress on Documentation in Applied Chemistry, the Conference on Radioastronomy (in Manchester), the Annual Congress of the British Chemical Society, a Symposium on Cavitation, the International Symposium on Problems of the Theory of Information, a session of the Faraday Society, the International Conference of Scientists to Avert the Dangers of an Atomic War, and so on. I myself took part in the latter conference. Although our group spent only a few days in Britain, we nevertheless succeeded in establishing contacts not only with the leaders and members of the conference but also with other leading British scientists and Fellows of the Royal Society.

My meetings with such British scholars as Bertrand Russell, Clement Davies, Lord Adrian, and many others, left me with the impression that they desire co-operation with Soviet scholars and are deeply interested in Soviet science.

Wherever I happened to meet British colleagues, whether in Moscow or London, Geneva or Harwell, the idea of the need for scientific co-operation was often stressed.

On their part, British scientists readily respond to invitations from Soviet colleagues to take part in our national scientific activities organised by the USSR Academy of Sciences and other scientific organisations in our country. In the spring of this year, E. Baldwin, professor in the University of London (and author of *The Dynamic Analysis of Biochemistry*, published and widely known in the Soviet Union), took part in the work of the Congress of Physiologists, Biochemists and Pharmacologists held in Kiev. The British astronomer M. Ellison, at the invitation of the USSR Academy of Sciences, took part in the solemn inauguration of the Crimea astro-physical observatory. British scientists were also invited to the session of the USSR Academy of Sciences on the peaceful utilisation of nuclear energy, and so on.

The meetings of scientific workers from different countries at scientific congresses and conferences do much to forward a greater utilisation and popularisation of the achievements of science and technology.

Very important for the strengthening of scientific ties between our two countries is the exchange of lecturers. In 1955, at the invitation of the University of London, Academicians V. A. Engelhardt and V. A. Ambartsumyan went to Britain and lectured with success to crowded audiences on biochemistry and astronomy respectively. Corresponding Fellow of the USSR Academy of Sciences S. P. Tolstov has also received an invitation from the University of London to deliver several lectures on archaeology at that university and at other British universities.

In the same year Soviet scholars welcomed British colleagues who had been invited to lecture at the USSR Academy of Sciences. The British historian G. Thomson, and the Professor of Zoology in the University of London, P. Medawar, F.R.S., gave several lectures, in spite of the shortness of their stay, in various departments of the Academy and at Moscow University. Their lectures were very popular with the Muscovites, especially the young people.

At the beginning of 1956 several other British scholars are to visit the Soviet Union: P. Dirac, professor in the University of Cambridge, F.R.S. and Honorary Fellow of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and V. Astbury, professor in the University of Leeds. There is every reason to expect their lectures to be followed with great interest by Soviet scholars.

With time, this form of scientific contact is bound to increase in scope, in view of its obvious advantages over other forms of scholarly co-operation, namely the immense possibilities for popularising scientific achievements and for establishing personal contacts with wide circles in the world of science.

Another important means of exchanging knowledge, besides personal contacts and meetings of scientists, is scientific information. Our Academy of Sciences carries on a regular exchange of publications with many scientific organisations in Britain.

While looking briefly into the history of this subject, one must mention that the exchange of books between our Academy and scientific institutions in Great Britain began as far back as the end of the eighteenth century, but until quite lately it was limited both as to the number of institutions involved and as to the amount of literature sent and received. The table given below shows the trend of development of this exchange within the last five years.

	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954
Sent	2,220	3,591	4,842	4,188	6,373
Received	1,409	2,084	2,784	3,472	5,816

In 1954 the number of library items received from Great Britain was nearly 2,500 more than in 1953 and four times as many as in 1950. The sending of Academy of Sciences publications to Britain has increased correspondingly.

At the present time the Library of the USSR Academy of Sciences exchanges publications with 123 scientific institutions, research institutes, libraries,

museums and universities in Great Britain. Nearly half of these are institutions working on problems of mathematics, physics, chemistry, technology, biology and geography, apart from multiple institutions.

Among the main institutions with which the exchanges are carried on are the Royal Society (London), the British Academy (London), the British Museum of Natural Science, the Royal Society in Edinburgh, the Bodleian Library in Oxford, the Department of Scientific and Industrial Research in London, the Faraday Society, the Chemical Society of London, and so on. During the first ten months of 1955 the Library of the USSR Academy of Sciences alone sent to Britain 6,074 library items and received 4,906 from British organisations.

Publications are also sent by the Academy Library to individual scholars.

Besides the Library of the USSR Academy of Sciences, other libraries take part in the exchange of publications, as do for instance the Fundamental Library on Social Sciences, and the Lenin State Library, which contains, as many probably know, some 18,000,000 printed publications in 160 different languages. This library exchanges publications with more than thirty British universities, institutes and scientific societies. The figures are sufficient to explain the importance of the exchange of printed scientific publications for the development of science, and its close connection with the general cultural exchange between our two countries.

The USSR Academy of Sciences receives a great number of letters, offprints and books from individual British scholars. Some of the letters contain requests for one scientific work or another, others propose an exchange of information on the latest scientific achievements. Soviet and British astronomers, for instance, have for some time been exchanging matter for the astronomical year-books published respectively in our two countries, which contain pre-calculations of the position of the sun, moon and planets, and of all astronomical phenomena (eclipses, position of stars, and so on). It would be very difficult to work out these calculations in any one country. On the initiative of Soviet astronomers *important work is being done on drawing up a catalogue of weak stars*. Greenwhich Observatory is taking part in this work.

A no less close collaboration exists in the field of chemistry also. As a result of personal contacts and mutual visits, Soviet and British chemists have come to agree on the necessity of exchanging the latest information on their achievements in their branch of science. They draw up surveys of what has been done for publication in periodicals. The first batch of such surveys on the development of Soviet chemistry is at present being translated into English for publication in Britain. Soviet chemists are in turn expecting to receive in the near future similar information from Britain for inclusion in Soviet publications.

The desire of Soviet and British scientists to make it possible for scientific workers in different countries to share their experience, and the results of their achievements in science and technology, is easy to understand, because only through combined effort can new successes be reached in that field of science which is meant to serve the aims of peace and the raising of the living standard of the human race.

I would like to recall here the words of a British scientist who visited our country in the autumn of 1955. He said that the friendship between the Soviet and British peoples was very important to world peace, and that the scholars of our two countries ought to set the example.

We Soviet scientists heartily agree.

**The above article was specially written for
this issue of the Anglo-Soviet Journal.**

A MAGICIAN IN MOSCOW

Horace King

SO MUCH has been written of music, ballet, opera, drama and films in the USSR, and mostly in terms of praise, that its best-known artists require little introduction, since they enjoy international distinction. Any one of them, if not more than one, is always at some time away abroad touring and thrilling audiences, great and small. They enjoy even greater fame and reverence within their own country ; and I cannot imagine many, if any, Soviet artists achieving such fame as the result of a " lucky break ", as is so often the case in the west, for the earliest signs of talent are encouraged, and carefully steered, by skilled and experienced people under proper conditions. My interest, however, was to discover how the masses of ordinary people found their pleasures.

The first programme of light entertainment I was invited to see was a Tatar company of singers and dancers. I did not get excited, because it did not sound quite my forte ; but it was a grand show, with traditional songs and dances and sketches. So I was ready to see another the following evening, this time by a Ukrainian company. It was another grand programme, with traditional differences. In both there was a great deal of humour ; even the fiercest dances were performed with a smile. The concerted numbers from the ladies were particularly amusing, with songs with funny topical couplets which the huge audiences loved, roaring with laughter and applauding. The performers had to give several repeats, and in doing so they cleverly added new and amusing couplets. To see women " going over big " as comics was indeed a unique experience. How I enjoyed the wonderful traditional dance scenas, with subtle dance movements creating most impressive effects.

The following evening, Sunday, I went to the Moscow Circus, which presented, of course, a typical circus programme, with fewer animal acts than here, but with the usual wire-walking, juggling and trapeze acts, a clever dog act, spectacular rifle shooting, some bareback riding *and a magician* ! The first Soviet magician I had ever seen ! His name was Ivanov, a youngish, good-looking man, with a lady assistant. He performed about half a dozen tricks, all very smoothly, and in silence, to a musical accompaniment. I liked his act ; it had some very nice touches. Later in the programme came an excellent performer in a remarkable balancing act with a lady at the top of a high ornamental ladder : I recognised him as Ivanov the magician again. The clowns worked very hard, their comedy occupying nearly half the evening's programme. There were many funny sketches, featuring an excellent " Chaplin "-style comedian with the strange name of *Karandash*, which in Russian means *pencil*. The performance opened with some clowning to introduce the comedian. How that crowded audience roared at the antics of this wonderful team of comics ! In fact they loved the whole show.

The best way I know to find out about audiences is to play to them ; so I became anxious to perform myself, and my first opportunity came when I went to Tiflis. Here I was included in a variety programme in one of the summer theatres. When I saw the extensive billing all over the city, and in the newspapers, I became a bit scared, because I was not able to offer a programme quite as I should have liked, with a limit of " props," and without my usual accomplished assistant, my wife. After a short morning rehearsal, I prepared to meet my first Soviet audience in the evening. The show was the Moscow State Ladies' Variety Orchestra, led by Ramon Romanov, and it also included a very good adagio act. Ramon Romanov led the orchestra, and was reminiscent of Ted Ray and his " fiddling and fooling " act, for he both acted

in comedy sketches and played his violin expertly. My apprehension had received some comforting reassurance from two charming ladies from the Georgian VOKS who were my helpful interpreters and guides ; I can only remember them as Helen and Innes, but I associate them with the wonderful reception I received from my first Soviet audience. Also I would like to add special thanks to Ramon Romanov for his excellent help and co-operation. It was the kind of help you get from a " good trouper." After my performance I received a spur of encouragement towards the magical interest of my mission when a member of the company, in complimenting me on my act, told me of a club in Moscow where specialists in magic met. This was indeed something—the very place I had been seeking for years ; the place the Magic Circle wanted me to reach, to convey to its members the sincere greetings of the British magicians. Helen, my interpreter on-stage, kindly wrote carefully translated details for me, and I was very happy.

Next day I flew to Sukhumi, where I was met by Mr. Otory Kiknadze of the Georgian OKS, and where I was to perform again that evening with another company. During the car drive from the airport to the hotel, Otory had fun pointing out to me my posters, which seemed to be everywhere ; they were even in the hall of the hotel. This company was led by a pair of talented young fellows, twins, and was more in the form of a concert party ; it included a musical ensemble. Again there was much comedy in the show, and the twins proved themselves first-class comedians ; in fact the whole company were talented and accomplished. The pianist spoke a little English, self taught by radio and reading, and did very well. I again enjoyed a grand welcome and reception, and was ably assisted on-stage by young Eugene Makarov of the Moscow VOKS, a smart young interpreter.

Next day, on to Gagra, via the beautiful Lake Ritza, high in the Georgian mountains. At Gagra, another Black Sea resort, I gave my third professional performance, with the same company and before a similar warm-hearted, enthusiastic audience.

For each of my three performances I received 500 roubles, which I thought most generous. At each of the summer theatres there must have been an audience of something between 1,000 and 1,500, quite large. When it is precisely time for the show to commence, and the audience are usually all seated, they applaud. No attempt is made to wait and see if the curtain is going up. The applause is not prolonged ; to me it implied a signal to the performers that the assembled audience were quite ready to receive the show. If I were presenting a show over there I should want to take up the curtain for the start a minute before time, just to try to beat that clap ! Encore requests from the audience are made by a call which sounded to me when I first heard it like *Boo-sss*. However, when I checked up with Eugene, he explained the word was *Bis* (" again "). I do not remember receiving the call for any of my performances, which is not unusual with a conjuring act ; but I did receive the slow rhythmic clap, very highly complimentary over there. It was also interesting to see, at the Ukrainian and Tatar companies' performances, how the children were sent up on to the stage with little notes carrying requests, how pleasantly they were received and how amusing the children sometimes were. I never saw one interrupt an artist ; always between acts.

Upon return to Moscow, I immediately pressed for the whereabouts of " the place where the magicians meet ", and provided a copy of the details given to me at Tiflis. First reactions were most disappointing, but inquiries continued, and in the meantime two performances had been arranged for me with the Leningrad Variety Company, now appearing in Moscow ; and again it was in a summer theatre in one of the many gardens of rest and culture. At the entrance and near to the gardens my name was on display with the letters " King " (in Russian) about four feet deep and in two colours. My perfor-

manances were on the Friday and Saturday evenings, and on the Friday mid-day a member of the company came to me at the hotel (Sovetskaya) to ascertain my requirements. I had decided in the meantime to make some modifications in my routine, to eliminate verbal interpretation, so, with the splendid support of an excellent pit orchestra, I performed in silence and was much happier. Here was another talented company, with different presentation. I had the opportunity of seeing a very funny sketch, wherein much comedy and satire was made of the many statues to be seen in all the gardens and parks throughout the Union. The numerous back-stage staff were most helpful, and all the company gave me a warm welcome and made me feel very comfortable, as had been my experience everywhere. Again a wonderful reception, and a lovely bouquet from a charming lady member of the company, who tendered congratulations in English. Everybody seemed pleased, and so was I. On my bidding them all goodnight, the director added *Do zavtra* ("until tomorrow"); I picked it up and as I left we all enjoyed exchanging *Do zavtras* with the goodnights and thank yous.

Next morning I was out early, because arrangements had been made for me to meet the Deputy Director of the Department of Variety and Musical Entertainments, Mr. Merlukov. At the Ministry I was welcomed by a tall, well-built, handsome man with a soft but deep and pleasant voice. This interview promised to be important.

I first conveyed to him my greetings from the members of the Magic Circle, London, and told him something of our society. He pleasantly accepted the greetings, and expressed pleasure at hearing of the creative work of the society. My first question was to ask if he knew of the place described to me by the professional at Tiflis; but alas, he seemed quite unaware of it. I then tried to find out how many artists were known to perform illusions as their entertainment. I further suggested that perhaps I could be furnished with some photographs of such performers, as they would be of immense interest to the Magic Circle and its members. Mr. Merlukov then asked whether I would like to hear something of the conditions of professional artists in the Soviet Union.

There is a School of Circus Art, and illusionists are included; here artists receive specialised training. When artists reach performance standard, they receive professional status, become part of the profession and are attached to a company or a theatre. All artists receive specialised training, and as they progress and their performance improves, so do their salaries. All employment in the USSR includes generous rest and vacational periods. An artist should have no difficulty in improving his salary, but it is not possible under any circumstances whatsoever for that salary to be reduced, whether in respect of old age, infirmity, ill health, or even deterioration of performance. The latter is apparently giving some trouble. It is realised that among a minority of artists it causes a condition of indifference to the creative aspects of their work. One does not have to know much about the USSR to appreciate how serious this can be, since it conflicts with the attitude desired of all Soviet citizens, particularly those engaged in creative and cultural professions. Mr. Merlukov told me that negotiations were in progress between the Artists' Trade Union, Estrada (Variety) and the Ministry, to find a system of maintaining scales without injustice, and that it was proving a difficult problem. These three organisations determine the standards required for the artists' salaries.

Artists are encouraged to develop new material and acts. Performers present the Ministry with schemes for revising their acts, or with entirely new performances in order to prepare and rehearse their new material. During this time their salaries continue as usual. Costumes and properties required are furnished by the State, and technically remain its property. Individualists may well revolt against these conditions, but I do invite them to consider for a moment and, as individualists, to realise that the originalities in their own

particular work and performances cannot, in these circumstances, be duplicated by any other artists. Hence individualism can assert itself where, and when, it matters most.

Artists are required to be seen in all parts of the Soviet Union ; remoteness from Moscow or the main cities is considered no excuse for any citizens being out of reach of current entertainment, and extensive tours are therefore organised. Artists and companies choose and arrange these tours by negotiation with Estrada. Country touring means double pay and free first-class travel by rail and air. All the artists' touring arrangements are handled by a special Theatrical Touring Bureau. The transport of equipment, the organisation of journeys and travels, the hotels and accommodation and all the publicity are carried out entirely by the bureau. In the event of a postponement, or a cancellation, it is their job to make all the necessary adjustments. The provision of such a service leaves the artists free to concentrate on their performances.

Many programmes and performances presented in country districts are run at a loss, simply because there are not the numbers in population to create the audiences ; and in these parts the charge for admission is less, only three roubles. The losses are made good from a special fund for the purpose within the Ministry ; in spite of such liabilities, the scheme as a whole provides a profit to the State. In answer to a question about television, Mr. Merlukov explained that for a television performance an artist received his normal fee plus fifty per cent. Two hours passed all too quickly ; I was very grateful to Mr. Merlukov for the information he had given me.

That evening I gave my second performance in Moscow, and on returning to my dressing room I received a visit from the Director of Estrada for Moscow. He complimented me on my performance, and added that he was sorry that I was not available longer, so that more people in Moscow might see me. This was indeed a compliment.

While I was in Leningrad, waiting to board a river-bus, a smiling Russian elbowed his way through the group of waiting passengers to approach me. The interpreter explained : "The gentleman says he was applauding you in Moscow four days ago !" He then added some appropriate compliments. A very pleasant incident, which I shall always remember.

My next and final performance was at Leningrad, when I appeared with Alexandr Blakman's Modern Stage Band, with a strong supporting company, in the theatre in the garden of culture situated on the famous Nevsky Prospect. This was a different show from anything I had previously seen. The company included an excellent adagio trio, husband wife and daughter ; the wife very kindly and delightfully assisted me in my performance. There were also a number of character artists and a very good comedian with a couldn't-care-less style. Alexandr Blakman led the band in a suave, stylish manner, and displayed amazing versatility when he performed a clever character burlesque of the modern "wide boy" in a musical number ; and in another comedy sketch with the comedian he astonished me by playing in turn most of the instruments in the band.

When I attended an afternoon rehearsal, I met the musical director, who spoke a little English. He proved a wonderful help, and could not do enough for me ; he rehearsed the band in a strong, well-chosen arrangement to support my evening's performance. The show played to a crowded house, and I again enjoyed a wonderful reception and received a huge bouquet from Alexandr Blakman. I struggled through my very few words in Russian, and I had to return five times to acknowledge applause. I think it was a warm-hearted gesture because I came from Britain.

For each of my two performances in Moscow and the third in Leningrad I received 300 roubles, I presume the difference was because of the town and country salary scales.

I shall always remember and appreciate my inclusion in the several programmes, and the alacrity with which they were organised. It was not known in Moscow that I was a performer until after I had arrived. For my part, I had not come prepared to appear and be presented in the way I was, and had only considered impromptu and informal occasions.

The Council and members of the Magic Circle were of course disappointed that I had failed to find a club where fellow magicians congregated, but I still believe such a place exists.

My conclusions make it hard for me to imagine any other place in the world better for the light entertainment profession. Think of the conditions of employment ; the many varied and extensive venues of all kinds of light entertainment ; the opportunities for originality, which when achieved remains exclusive to the performer ; the encouragement of talent, skill and creative art ; the " part of the service " direction from trained professional producers ; the comprehensive services of the Theatrical Touring Bureau ; and finally (speaking as a several times privileged member) the large and enthusiastic audiences to be found everywhere.

The final farewells from the Leningraders included a special comment for me : the people had very much enjoyed my performance the previous evening ; would I come again ? Well, you have only to ask ! I shall be delighted, and to bring some artist friends with me !

SCR Publications

The Anglo-Soviet Journal

A general quarterly magazine publishing authoritative articles by British and Soviet writers on the arts and sciences in the USSR, surveys of the Soviet specialist press, and reviews of English and Russian books.

Each issue 2/6, post free 2/9

Annual subscription, post free, 10/-

SCR members 8/6

Bulletins

There are Soviet Information Bulletins on Architecture : Chess Education : Film : History : Law : Literature : Medicine : Music Psychology : Science and Engineering : Social Sciences : Theatre each appearing three or four times a year.

Each Bulletin 1/6, post free 1/9 per issue

Annual Subscription, 6/- each Bulletin, post free

Booklets

The SCR also publishes occasional booklets, such as " Ulanova on Soviet Ballet," " Obraztsov and the Puppet Theatre," etc. Each 2/6, post free 2/9.

ANGLO-RUSSIAN RELATIONS IN THE FIELD OF HISTORICAL STUDIES

A. M. Pankratova

*Chairman, National Committee of Soviet Historians
Chief Editor, VOPROSY ISTORII*

CULTURAL RELATIONS between Russia and England in the field of historical studies have existed for many centuries. They were created by the journeys of English travellers to Russia and Russian travellers to England. The reports of these travellers remain to this day a valuable source for the study of the histories of our two countries, and are utilised by scholars. In Russia the reports of Chancellor (1553), Jenkinson (1557), Randolph (1568), Bowes (1583-1590), Fletcher (1588-91), Collins (1659-1667) and others are carefully studied. The first books on the history of England appeared in Russia as early as the seventeenth century. To these belong the *History of Charles the First* and the new editions of the *Chronograph*, containing accounts of various events that had taken place in western Europe. Peter I's letters and papers, and the works of his contemporaries, have preserved many valuable data on the Britain of the late seventeenth and the early eighteenth centuries, which are of importance to British historians also. The translations of Blackstone on administration (1780-2), of Bentham and Macaulay (1860-5), and of Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations*, were widely read in Russia. The writer Radishchev and the great revolutionary democrats Herzen, Belinsky and Chernishevsky devoted many inspired passages to the history of the British people, studying with particular interest and sympathy the history of the English revolution. Chernishevsky translated and annotated John Stuart Mill's *Principles of Political Economy*.

The classic nineteenth-century works which give a scientific exposition of the history of British capitalism, *The Condition of the Working Class in England*, by Engels, and K. Marx's *Capital*, became known earlier to Russian readers than to English.

Many Russian historians have devoted their energies to research on problems of British economic and political history. Among them is the economist I. I. Yanzhul, whose M.A. thesis, *Research on British Indirect Taxation*, resulted from his work on original sources in British archives. His Ph.D. thesis is on *British Free Trade*. The history of taxation in Britain is the subject of works by the Moscow scholars I. Ozerov (*Income-tax in Britain*) and P. Genzel (*Death Duties in Britain*).

The late nineteenth century witnessed the development of the scholarly activity of one of Russia's greatest bourgeois historians, a man of tremendous erudition and breadth of interest, M. M. Kovalevsky (1851-1916). He made a long stay in Britain, where he worked in the British Museum, the Public Record Office, and other libraries, and met Maine, Spencer, Bryce and Morley. Here too he met Karl Marx, who influenced him to a certain extent.

During his stay in Britain Kovalevsky was a member of the Athenæum. He gave a series of lectures in the University of Oxford, which were later published in English under the title *Modern Custom and Ancient Law in Russia* (1891). In the nineties he read papers at the Congress of the British Association at Oxford (*The Beginnings of the Labour Problem in Italy*) and at the Congress of Orientalists in London (*Iranian Culture in the Caucasus*), and contributed to the London *Archæological Journal* edited by Hulme.

Kovalevsky's M.A. thesis (*History of Police Administration and Police Courts in English Counties, from the most ancient times till the death of*

Edward III) and his Ph.D. thesis (*English Social Structure at the End of the Middle Ages*) are both founded on archive data collected by him during his stay in Britain. In his later research work Kovalevsky more than once returned to the history of England (the “English *pugachevshchina*”; sections of *The Economic Growth of Europe up to the Birth of Capitalist Economy; From direct popular self-government to representative government, and from patriarchal monarchy to parliamentarism*).

In his commemorative speech on Kovalevsky, P. G. Vinogradov, president of the committee of the Anglo-Russian Society, showed that Kovalevsky was one of the first Russian scholars to know Great Britain in all its variety of social currents and types. He said that Kovalevsky highly appreciated the attitude of the British towards research work, the close ties between theoretical elaboration and living reality, the subordination of detail to the leading idea; he appreciated their breadth of interest, contrasting the typical British scholar with the German. Kovalevsky greatly influenced the development of Russian historical thought.

Still more important and lasting was his influence on his younger colleague, P. G. Vinogradov (1854-1925), who not only produced a number of remarkable works on English history, which represented a new stage in the development of European historiography, but was also the founder of a whole historical school. Although his main works are devoted to the history of Britain, there is a distinct link between his creative work and the problems with which the peasant reform of 1861 and its consequences faced Russian society. The problem of the community became the pivot of Vinogradov's interest. British history could yield an answer to this question. And all Vinogradov's fundamental works, which are classic works on British history, are the result of long and careful research in British archives and of close personal contacts with British scholars.

In 1883-4 he spent fifteen months in England, working in the Public Record Office, the British Museum and the libraries of Oxford, Cambridge, Cheltenham and elsewhere. It was a rare occurrence for a foreigner to delve into the storehouses of Oxford and Cambridge as he did. In the Public Record Office he discovered an MS which turned out to be a fragment of one of the rare and curious Hundreds Rolls of the eighteenth century (Warwickshire). At the British Museum he discovered a fragment of records of court proceedings of the thirteenth century, drawn up for the famous English lawyer Bracton, and annotated by him, which had served as a basis for his treatise on English laws and customs (*Bracton's Notebook*). In 1884 Vinogradov published an article in the *Athenaeum* on his discovery, which was rightly regarded by his contemporaries as “epoch-making”.* It was his talks with Vinogradov about the wealth of English material on legal history that inspired Maitland to begin his work among the documents of the Public Record Office, which brought him world fame. It was in those years too that Vinogradov established close personal relations with such well-known British scholars as Pollock, Powell, Freeman and others.

Vinogradov's Ph.D. thesis, *Research on the Social History of Britain* (1887), was, on the suggestion of Oxford University, expanded in English into the work *Villeinage in England* which brought much response both in Britain and elsewhere. During the following years, when he was professor in Moscow University, Vinogradov kept in touch with British scholars. In 1891 he again went to Britain, where he continued his work on the social history of that country. At the invitation of Oxford University he gave a course of lectures,

* In 1887 Maitland published *Bracton's Notebook*, with Vinogradov's article. According to Maitland, Vinogradov had in a few weeks mastered Bracton better than any Englishman (Selden excepted).

the so-called Ilchester course, on slavophilism and its influence on Russian culture.

The new period in Vinogradov's activity which began in 1903 brought him into still closer contact with the British scholastic world. Several of his works were published in English. In 1903 he succeeded Pollock in the chair of comparative law. In 1906, after Maitland's death, Vinogradov, together with Pollock, was entrusted with the editing of the publications of the Selden Society. He helped to produce the collective work *Cambridge Medieval History*. At the request of the British Academy he undertook the editing of the series *Records of Social and Economic History*. Under his supervision the works of his pupils on their research on social history and law began to appear in the collected volume *Oxford Studies in Social and Legal History*.

Vinogradov was honorary doctor of several British and western European universities.

Among Vinogradov's numerous pupils and his successors, D. M. Petrushevsky and A. N. Savin concentrated on English agrarian history. Petrushevsky's main work, *Wat Tyler's Rebellion*, links up with Vinogradov's work and is founded on the archive material of the Public Record Office and the British Museum which he had collected during his stay in Britain in the 'nineties.

It was Savin who carried the study of the English village farther, into the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In 1900-2 he worked at the British Museum, the Public Record Office and the Bodleian. The fruit of his labours was his M.A. thesis, *The English Village under the Tudors* (Moscow, 1903).

In later years Savin used to speak of the help he had received from Maitland, and would recall with particular gratitude two evenings during which Maitland commented to him on documents relating to old English law-suits.

While in Britain, Savin read a paper at the Royal Historical Society in London on the remnants of villeinage in England. This paper provoked lively interest and was published in the *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 1923, while excerpts from his *Early Records of the Court of Chancery* were published in the *English Historical Review*, 1902.

In the years that followed (1904-5, 1908, 1910, 1912, 1914), Savin repeated his visits to Britain to work in the archives. The result of this research was his Ph.D. thesis, *English Secularisation*, parts of which were published in Britain.* In 1922-3 he came to Britain again, and soon after died there, having caught a chill in the Public Record Office.

All that I have mentioned so far concerns the study of British agrarian history. The rapid development of capitalist industry in Russia increased the interest in the study of British industry and trade. This interest found expression in the translation of the works of Rogers, Ashley, Cunningham, Gibbins and the Webbs. Among individual studies on British history and trade, one must mention M. N. Tugan-Baranovsky's work *Periodical Industrial Crises; History of British Crises, and the General Theory of Crises*.

The 1905 revolution aroused a great interest in the history of revolutionary movements in the West, especially in the history of the English and the French revolutions. It was during that time that translations were made of the works of Gardiner, Weingarten, Stern, Carlyle, Morley, Montague and others. A number of works on the history of the English revolution (Savin's lectures, Fortunatov's book on Sir Henry Vane) also appeared.

Thus even in the eighteenth century, but principally in the second half of the nineteenth and the early twentieth centuries, subject-matter formed a close link between Russian and British historical studies. Works by Russian scholars, their personal research in British archives and libraries, and the translations

* Under the title *English Monasteries on the Eve of Dissolution*.

into Russian of fundamental scientific literature, were not the only links. There was also the quick response of Russian scholars to important scientific events in the west, and particularly in Britain, which appeared in such journals as *Russkaya Mysl*, *Yuridichesky Vestnik*, *Istoricheskiye Izvestiya*, *Zhurnal Ministerstva Narodnogo Prosveshcheniya*.

A. N. Savin wrote an excellent obituary notice on the British historian Maitland, in which he described the close scientific and personal links between this scholar and Vinogradov and himself, referring to Maitland as his teacher and showing Maitland's high opinion of Vinogradov.

At the beginning of the twentieth century, in addition to reviews of British publications and bibliographical matter in various journals, surveys of new literature on general history, in which the analysis of works by British authors was of importance, began to appear under the editorship of D. N. Yegorov.

In characterising the ties between Russian and British historical studies, another aspect must be mentioned—the joint participation of Russian and British historians in scientific conferences, congresses, and so on. Historians of both countries took part in the Paris Congress of 1900 (International Congress of Comparative History) where, among others, M. Kovalevsky read a paper on *Labour Legislation in the later Middle Ages*.

Among the papers read by Russian historians in Berlin at the third Congress of Historians, Vinogradov's *Natural Law and Justice in English Legal Science in the Sixteenth Century* should be mentioned. At the fourth Congress of Historians, held in London in 1913, the Russian delegation took third place for number of papers read. Among the Russian historians who attended were E. V. Tarlé, P. N. Ardashev, N. M. Bubnov, V. E. Grabar, I. Lubimenko and P. G. Vinogradov. In all the sections of the congress Russian and British historians established close scientific contacts.

At the beginning of the twentieth century, owing to the activity of G. V. Plekhanov, and more especially of V. I. Lenin, Marxism was spreading in Russia. For nearly half a century Russian advanced thought had eagerly sought a correct scientific theory and had intently followed every "latest word" from Europe or America. Lenin wrote: "Marxism was indeed dearly bought by Russia, at the cost of half a century of unheard-of suffering and sacrifices, of extraordinary revolutionary heroism, of incredible energy and selfless searchings, of teaching, trial by practice, disappointments, checking and comparisons with the experience of Europe."* Having won the minds of the advanced democratic intelligentsia and of class-conscious workers, Marxism also penetrated into the ranks of the scholars. At the time, most Russian historians still held idealistic positions. But the trend of their research itself showed that it was impossible to understand the true march of history without taking into account the decisive importance of economic conditions and determining the laws of development of the historical process. We can trace an approach to this view in the works of Kovalevsky and Vinogradov, of Petrushevsky and Savin. Then the first Russian Marxist historians made their appearance. The struggle of ideas which had developed before the 1917 revolution ended in a victory for Marxism over all other standpoints.

Since the Revolution, all branches of science, including historical studies, have blossomed out. The number of scientific libraries, archives and scientific institutes, and the scale of research work, have vastly increased and continue to grow. Among works on English history published since the October Revolution worthy of first mention are those of Academician F. A. Rothstein, who in 1890 had emigrated from Russia to Britain, where for many years he contributed to the British Marxist press and did much to strengthen the British labour movement. Rothstein took a deep interest in the history of the British

* V. I. Lenin, *Works*, v. 31.

labour movement, and in particular that of Chartism. This found expression in his works *Sketches of the History of the Labour Movement in Britain* (1924)* and *The Forerunners of the International*. His work *The Seizure and Enslavement of Egypt* (1925),† one of a series on the history of imperialism, evoked much interest in progressive circles in Britain and other west European countries.

A strong group of historians specialising in British history has been formed in the Moscow State University and the Historical Institute. This is already the third generation of Russian scholars studying Britain—Academician E. A. Kosminsky, Corresponding Fellow of the USSR Academy of Sciences S. I. Arkhangel'sky, Professors V. M. Lavrovsky and V. F. Semënov. This group, continuing the best traditions of Russian nineteenth and early twentieth-century mediæval studies, has set itself the task of working out the problems of British history in the light of Marxism-Leninism, and has already achieved important results.

E. A. Kosminsky studied the Hundreds Rolls in the Public Record Office in 1925, and wrote his well-known work *The English Village in the Thirteenth Century*. This distinguished scholar, one of the foremost Soviet historians, has been working indefatigably on problems of English history for several decades. His basic work, *Research on the Agrarian History of Thirteenth-century England*, was published in 1947.‡

We are much gratified that British specialists regard Kosminsky as an outstanding authority on his subject, and that his works are widely known in Britain.

V. M. Lavrovsky, while in England, studied maps and parliamentary records of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, which formed the basis of his work *Parliamentary Enclosures of Commons in Britain in the Late Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries*. S. I. Arkhangel'sky (the author of *Agrarian Legislation of the Great English Revolution*) is working on problems connected with the English revolution. This subject has attracted the attention of a number of Soviet scholars. The Moscow scholar V. F. Semënov has been studying this period as well as the period immediately preceding it. The problems of enclosures, of the loss of land by the peasants, and of peasant risings, form the subject of his work *Enclosures and Peasant Movements in England in the Sixteenth Century*, as well as of some other works of his. Among the questions studied by the representatives of the "fourth generation", the following should be mentioned: *The Early Feudal Town* (Y. A. Levitsky); *The Development of the English Feudal Village in the Eleventh and Thirteenth Centuries* (M. A. Barg); *The History of the Feudal English State in Connection with the Rise of Parliament* (E. V. Gutnova). A pointer to the interest of Soviet historians in British history is the fact that special sessions devoted to the tercentenary of the Long Parliament were held by the Department of History and Philosophy of the USSR Academy of Sciences and by the Historical Faculty of the Moscow State University. An important achievement of Soviet historical studies was the publication in 1954 of the collective two-volume work *The English Bourgeois Revolution*, which was well received in the British scholastic press.

The interest of Russian and Soviet historians in the history of Britain is far from being confined to the Middle Ages. An important group of our historians has specialised in research on the history of British foreign policy in modern and recent times, and especially on the history of Anglo-Russian and Anglo-Soviet relations. Nikiforov, Andreyev, Faygina and Stanislavskaya are working on Russo-British relations in the eighteenth century. The young scholars

* *From Chartism to Labourism* (1929).

† *Egypt's Ruin* (1910).

‡ English translation to be published shortly by Basil Blackwell.

Zak, Gudkina and Shparo have devoted themselves to the study of British foreign policy at the time of the Napoleonic wars and of the Holy Alliance. The famous Soviet specialist on the history of international relations Prof. A. S. Yerusalmitsky has published a number of studies on Anglo-German relations in the epoch of imperialism. The specialist on Japan Galperin has published an important work on the Anglo-Japanese alliance. Soviet historians have written several books on British foreign policy since 1917. Such are the works of Volkov, Lemin, Nikolayev, Nekrich, Ivanov, Matveyev. Much was done by the late I. S. Zvavich, who spent several years in England, to form cadres of Soviet specialists on modern British history, and especially the history of British foreign policy.

As much, if not more, attention is paid to research on the social history of Britain in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Radicalism and feudal socialism in the first half of the nineteenth century (V. Nemanov); Chartism and the first trade unions (A. Yerofeyev, A. Dergunova, L. Golman, A. Shapiro); the labour movement during the first years of the Russian Revolution and the political crisis on the eve of the first world war (E. Chernyak, L. Kertman); the revolutionary situation in the years 1917-1920 (A. Chernyayev); the general strike of 1926; the Labour Party and its internal policy; the development of the British Communist Party—such are the subjects in British history which particularly attract Soviet historians, and especially the younger ones. One cannot fail to agree with Academician E. A. Kosminsky's conclusions at the session of the Department of History and Philosophy of the USSR Academy of Sciences on the 220th anniversary of the Academy: "It was Russian scholars who blazed the trail of research on a series of fundamental problems of British agrarian history."

Much is done in the USSR to acquaint the Soviet scholastic world with the achievements of British historians. Their most important works are published in translation; learned journals publish reviews of new British books and information on British scholars. British historians visit our country at the invitation of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and read papers acquainting Soviet scholars with the work of British historians. Thus in 1953 a group of British scholars came to the USSR. The group included the medievalist Dr. R. G. Hilton, lecturer at the University of Birmingham. During these visits the British scholars acquaint themselves with the work of Soviet historians. In particular R. G. Hilton met the medievalists E. A. Kosminsky, S. M. Arkhangelsky, V. F. Semenov and Y. A. Levitsky, the archaeologist S. V. Kiselev, and others. Writing of his impressions of his visit, Dr. Hilton stressed that the work of the Soviet scholars Piotrovsky in Armenia and Kuftin in Georgia, and of archaeologists in Central Asia, is bound to make archaeologists all over the world largely reconsider their ideas on the ancient culture of the Near East and Asia.

In their turn Soviet scholars visit Britain. At the end of 1952, in connection with British-Soviet Friendship Month, Academician E. A. Kosminsky went to Britain as a member of the Soviet cultural delegation. He lectured in the Universities of London, Oxford, Cambridge and Birmingham, where he found a most friendly atmosphere. The number of invitations to lectures and meetings was so great that it was impossible to accept them all. In Oxford so many questions were put to the Soviet historian that Christopher Hill described the occasion as a veritable "cross-examination".

Many Soviet historians entertain constant close relations with their British colleagues. Academician E. A. Kosminsky and Professor B. F. Porshnev are permanent contributors to the British journal *Past and Present*. E. A. Kosminsky has also been elected honorary fellow of the English Historical Association, which publishes the journal *History*.

Working side by side at international scientific congresses is an important

factor in strengthening contacts between Soviet and British historians. At the sixth Congress in Oslo (1928), the delegation of Soviet historians, which included V. P. Volgin, E. A. Kosminsky, E. V. Tarlé and others, met British scholars, and Kosminsky read a paper on *The English Village in the Thirteenth Century*.

In 1930, a Soviet delegation, which included V. P. Volgin, took part in the regular session of the International Committee of Historical Studies in Cambridge (later continued in Oxford and London).

Soviet historians took part in the seventh Congress of Historians held in Warsaw in 1933. As a member of this congress I remember with pleasure the contact which we then established with the British delegation, which included Professors Temperley, Webster, Gooch and Clapham, and other scholars.

Our scholars co-operate with British scholars at many other learned congresses besides those of historians. One may mention the third International Congress on Persian Art and Archaeology, held in Leningrad in 1953, which was attended by scholars from twenty-five countries, and the recent twenty-third Congress of Orientalists, held in Cambridge in 1954.* In September 1955, Soviet scholars attended the Congress of Byzantinists in Istanbul, where contact was established with the well-known British Byzantinist Talbot Rice.

Particularly fresh in our minds is the memory of the tenth International Congress of Historians in Rome, during which Soviet historians had many interesting meetings with their British colleagues. A fruitful exchange took place, for instance, between E. A. Kosminsky and M. Postan. I recall with particular pleasure an evening our delegation spent in the company of members of the British delegation, and I look forward to future collaboration with Professor Webster at the Bureau of the International Committee of Historical Studies, of which we have both been elected members.

Soviet historians fully share the opinion voiced by the British learned delegation, headed by Professor J. D. Bernal, which visited the Soviet Union in 1953: "We are convinced that the fruitful development of science on a world scale is impossible without the peaceful and friendly collaboration of all scholars, regardless of the political structure of the countries in which they live."

We are wholeheartedly in favour of strengthening Anglo-Soviet scientific contacts, because we are convinced that these ties will not only contribute to the development of science in our two countries but will also help to bring our peoples closer together and to strengthen world peace

Translated by T. SHEBUNINA.

**The above article was specially written for
this issue of the Anglo-Soviet Journal.**

* See *The Culture of Soviet Turkmenistan*, by S. M. Kuliev, *ANGLO-SOVIET JOURNAL*, Vol. XV, No. 4.

THE SOVIET ANTARCTIC EXPEDITION

W. G. Cass

IN VIEW OF the many important and interesting fields of research, the committee (Brussels) in charge of the Third International Geophysical Year (i.e. July 1, 1957, to December 1958) is giving special attention to Antarctic exploration, in which several countries are co-operating: the USA, Great Britain, France, Belgium, the Argentine, Japan, New Zealand, Australia and Chile.

The USSR, through its Academy of Sciences (AN) is also sending an expedition to the "sixth continent", in charge of Dr. M. M. Somovym (head of the Drift Station "North Pole 2"), during 1955-56. They will establish three scientific bases: (1) at or near the apparent coastline of the eastern section between 80° and 105° E. long.; (2) near the south magnetic pole; and (3) in the neighbourhood of the so-called "Pole of Relative Inaccessibility" of the Antarctic continent.

The current issue of *Science and Life* (*Nauka i Zhizn*) contains an interesting account of Russian participation in international Antarctic exploration, under the title of *In the Region of Ice-bound Silence*, by L. D. Dolgushin. The author briefly describes general conditions and early exploration work, including that of Captain James Cook (*Dzhems Kuk*) and the Russian expedition of 1819-21 under F. F. Bellinsgauzen and M. P. Lazarev.

The 1955-56 Soviet party will proceed to its destination in a powerful diesel electric ice-breaker, the *Ob*, of 12,000 tons, accompanied by a monotype auxiliary ship, the *Lena*. On board the former will be several research laboratories, including facilities for examining, including temperature examination, samples of soil, water and ice, from considerable depths, and also both marine and land flora and fauna, if any. Also accompanying the expedition will be some transport aircraft and auxiliary craft. The wide and varied experience already gained in north-polar research will be fully utilised in dealing with the many problems of living and working in the extreme south, with due allowance for the wide differences in conditions between north and south.

There will be two main divisions of work: marine and overland. The former will include a certain amount of investigation of oceans traversed on the way to the southern continent, including for instance the effect of the south-polar waters and currents on those of the South Atlantic or the Pacific, and also air currents and other matters associated with general navigation. The dry land section will comprise three groups: (a) geologico-geographical, (b) aerometeorological, and (c) geophysical; the objects of these are fairly self-evident. The most up-to-date instruments and equipment will of course be employed, though no details of these are given, and will include those needed for glaciological studies of ice and snow at various depths. By means of special seismic soundings, attempts will be made to determine the extent (thickness) of the ice cap. The nature and rate of movement of ice-masses or domes and the formation of icebergs will be studied. Special attention will be paid to polar radiation or luminescence, cosmic rays of the ionosphere, solar radiation, and so on.

Erratum

The name of Professor Gardner-Medwin (Liverpool School of Architecture) has in some earlier issues been included in error as a member of the SCR Architecture Committee. While the Professor is willing to help the Society with exhibitions of Russian architecture in his locality, he is unable to serve as a member of the Committee.

MICHURIN AND HIS TEACHINGS

Nikolai Tsitsin

THE centenary of the birth of Ivan Michurin, the great Russian scientist and practical horticulturist, was celebrated and commemorated by the USSR Academy of Sciences and throughout the Soviet Union. In addition to a rally at the Bolshoi Theatre in Moscow, there were many scientific gatherings of Academy Sections and Institutes. Special issues of learned periodicals published papers dealing with many aspects of Michurin's work.

Academician Nikolai Tsitsin, head of the USSR Academy of Sciences Botanical Gardens in Moscow, and Director of the All-Union Agricultural Exhibition in Moscow, spoke on the eve of his departure for Britain in November 1955, in the Academy's Department of Biological Sciences. His report was entitled "The Influence of Michurinist Theory on the Development of Botanical Research Work".

Nikolai Tsitsin has developed a hardy drought and disease resistant winter wheat hybrid, by crossing ordinary wheat with couch-grass, which latter is one of the great scourges of Russian farming.* The high harvest yield of the experimental plot harvested in the autumn of 1955 has decided the immediate future of this hybrid, which will be sown on experimental collective farm plots fairly widely for 1956.

SCIENCE in its progressive development has its key periods marking the beginning of a new trend, periods which are fundamental to the formation of new branches of learning. The significance of a scientist and his role in science is determined less by what he himself has done than by what his discoveries have brought to the further development of scientific thought. Biological science has produced a galaxy of great men, whose names head whole branches of knowledge and scientific trends. An honourable place among them is held by representatives of our own national science.

Michurin's discoveries laid the foundations for a new period in the development of the biological and agricultural sciences. The new Michurinist trend is chiefly related to the actively *transforming* role of the scientist's work. It was for this reason that the Michurinist movement arose and spread far and wide even during his lifetime.

The creative application of Michurin's teaching by scientific workers and working agriculturists has resulted in the successful production of valuable types of fruit and of berry-bearing, vegetable, grain and industrial crops, in the bringing into production of new plants, and in a considerable extension of the range of horticulture and agriculture. Michurinist methods have been applied in stock-raising, as a result of which valuable breeds of cattle, horses, sheep, pigs and other animals have been developed.

It is difficult, if not impossible, to make a brief survey of the successes achieved by Michurinists, not only in our own country but also abroad. I will therefore dwell mainly on the work we are doing and report on the results we have achieved by using Michurinist methods of work.

HYBRIDISATION has been the principal method of producing new types of wheat in recent decades in many countries. The finest present-day wheats in the world are the result of crossing. The Canadian spring wheat, *Marquise*, to which almost three-quarters of the sown area of North America is sown, for example, is a complex hybrid in the creation of which a not inconsiderable part was played by Siberian spring types. Many excellent hybrid wheats are grown both in the USSR and abroad. But all these crossings are made mainly between one kind or variety within the same species. Moreover, the greater number of such kinds are a combination of different forms of soft wheats. Inter-species

* See *Soviet Science Information Bulletin*, Vol. II, No. 4 (December 1955).

hybridisation by selectionists has not, however, succeeded in producing kinds of wheat which fully satisfy the requirements of agriculture. For this reason our activities from the very beginning have been along the line of wide crosses, and in particular of crossing cultivated plants with wild ones.

"From crossing wheat with wheat", Michurin said to me, "you will get wheat and nothing else. One must seek new ways of finding a component which is stronger than wheat itself."

In seeking strong parents for the creation of a new form of wheat, we turned to nature herself, with her abundant plants as yet unused by man, plants whose ecological plasticity, hardiness and other valuable properties are astounding, and which are all considerably in advance of the properties of any cultivated plants. This is quite understandable. The evolutionary process has been different in cultivated plants. Although they came from wild ones, they have been reworked by man for thousands of years for the satisfaction of his needs and, as a rule, to the detriment of the demands made by the plant itself. Wild flora, on the contrary, have for thousands of years been accumulating properties needed only by the plant in its struggle for existence and dissemination.

Darwin wrote that man selects for his own needs, while nature selects for the needs of the being under protection: every trait selected is of help, and the being becomes well accommodated to its conditions of life.

In fact, of course, despite many thousands of years of agriculture, the selection of plants in the world complex is comparatively poor. Not more than fifty to sixty agricultural crops are really widely disseminated.

It may therefore be said that man is only just beginning to utilise rationally the growing potential of the earth and to master the plant riches of the boundless natural flora. There are over 200,000 species of seed-bearing plants in nature, of which barely 250 are used in agriculture.

Natural plant resources are of immense proportions which can and must be used by man, both directly and as unlimited source material for the creation of a new world of cultivated plants.

Wild flora are an unlimited source, with the aid of which the researcher can transform the plant world of cultivated flora in the interests of man.

In developing our work along Michurinist lines, we turned our attention to the most virulent weed in our fields, couch-grass.

Couch-grass is to be met with all over the globe. It is difficult to find a plant more steadfast in its struggle for existence. Its ability to multiply is enormous: the tips of its shoots, protected by hard, scaly leaves, are so strong that they can emerge in any soil. Couch-grass is extremely drought and frost resistant, draws very little from the soil, and is highly resistant to fungoid disease. Finally, it is a perennial.

These advantages are particularly evident if you compare it with wheat. There is no type of wheat that is not subject to some disease or other. Yet there are some species of couch-grass which are almost entirely disease-resistant. Moreover, it retains its immunity against diseases even if artificially infected. While wheat annually suffers impoverishment from frost-bite, dry winds and other unfavourable natural conditions, couch-grass comes through untouched. While wheat will grow only on selected, well-cultivated, rich soil, the salt-marsh couch-grass prefers a salt marsh to the *chernozem* (black earth). Finally, wheat and couch-grass are poles apart in harvest yield. True, the wheat grain and the couch-grass grain are not comparable in size: 1,000 grains of wheat weigh 30 gr. while a similar quantity of couch-grass grain would weigh only 5-6 gr. But if you compare the harvest yields of wheat and of couch-grass from one plant, a different picture emerges. The advantages of couch-grass are its great bushing properties and the large number of grains in a single ear or ears. One ear in wheat will have three or four grains, while couch-grass will have from seven to nine. The number of economically valuable biological

qualities and characteristics in couch-grass are not comparable with those of any other agricultural crop.

To take these properties from wild couch-grass, combine them with those of wheat, and hand them on to a new crop, a hybrid wheat, has been one of the most rewarding and exciting tasks in selection. The solution of this problem opens up undreamed-of prospects for agriculture.

The first task we set ourselves may be summarised as obtaining new hybrid forms of both spring and winter wheat with improved qualities and characteristics. At the same time we set ourselves the task of creating a perennial wheat plant.

Great difficulties emerged during the work. In the first place, we had to make a thorough and comprehensive study of inter-species crosses, examine their morphology, the biology of the flowering, and their general behaviour in different conditions. Although these plants are fairly well known, we kept coming up against new phenomena, hitherto unnoticed and difficult to explain, the whole time, over a period of many years of work.

In studying the characteristics of perennial couch-grass, we discovered that couch-grasses have a whole range of annual, biennial, triennial and perennial forms. Moreover, our observations showed the existence of extensive polymorphism.

What results have we to show today from the wide crossing of couch-grass and wheat? Of the couch-grass/wheat hybrids, one of the most notable is No. 22850, which has economic qualities distinguishing it from the standard soft wheat *Lutescens* 62. It continues to stand well even when there is excessive moisture, it does not scatter if it is kept standing too long, it is easy to thresh, and its flour and bread qualities put it among the top grades of wheat. This type is resistant to fungoid disease and has a fairly good harvest yield. Collective farmers of the Moscow Region know No. 22850 well, and on some collective farms harvests of fifty or more centners per hectare have been gathered.

Hybrid No. 22850 has one other characteristic trait: it likes moisture, and even in rainy years gives a highly translucent grain, although the translucency of grain is known to fall sharply in a moist atmosphere. The translucent Kuban grains, in particular, become floury in rainy years. Hybrid No. 22850 is a rare exception to this. It would appear that it has inherited this peculiarity from couch-grass, which retains the translucence of its grain both in southern and in northern districts.

We have produced interesting types of annual winter-wheat/couch-grass hybrids. One of them, No. 599, has proved itself not only in the non-*chernozem* zone but also in central Asia. This type is totally immune to blight, even if artificially infected. It has a high harvest yield and will stand even with a harvest of forty or forty-five centners per hectare. A harvest of thirty or thirty-five centners per hectare over a big area has been gathered on several collective farms in the Moscow Region, which is a 25% increase over the standard harvest yield. There was a harvest of fifty-five centners of this type per hectare in 1955 on the Stalin collective farm, Lukhovitsky district, Moscow Region.

The new wheat/couch-grass hybrid No. 186 is also of considerable interest. In the dry conditions of 1955 it had a high harvest yield almost everywhere. On the Kalinin collective farm, Yaroslavl Region, up to forty-five and a half centners per hectare were harvested over an area of seven hectares, while the first field brigade harvested seventy-two centners per hectare on three hectares. The *Borets* collective farm, Bronitsky district, Moscow Region, harvested thirty-eight and a half centners per hectare over a sown area of 200 hectares in 1955.

The third interesting type, wheat/couch-grass hybrid No. 1, gives a very high harvest yield and stands very well. In a number of experiments this type has yielded seventy-two centners to the hectare without any visible tendency

to scatter. In production conditions this type yields forty-five or more centners to the hectare.

Over a period of years the Kirov collective farm, Vyrussk district (Estonian SSR), has been growing wheat/couch-grass hybrid for seed, and annually harvests a yield which is double that of other local grains. Individual plots yielded as much as seventy-one centners per hectare for the collective farmers in 1955. They noted that, despite rain and high winds, hybrid No. 1 stood well and did not scatter, in spite of its heavy ears.

The three types, No. 599, No. 185 and No. 1, have been sown over an area of 200,000 hectares in eleven Regions in the USSR.

The selection of annual spring- and winter-wheat/couch-grass hybrids has given positive results. With every year that passes these hybrids are becoming more and more widely recognised in production.

Wide crossing of wheat with couch-grass has made it possible to approach the question of branched wheat from a new angle. During research we established that in wild conditions there is much branching in the plant ear. All types of couch-grass, eared plants and other wild cereal plants have been included, to form a plant with a branched formation of the ear. Only one kind, *Agropyrum elongatum*, tends to produce deviating forms, with a tendency to two ears in an ear formation. These qualities of the wild species have been used in hybridising them with cultivated plants and particularly with wheat.

The most varied range of hybrid plants with branched ears has been produced as a result of this work. It is interesting that all of them, as we had expected, are winter plants. To obtain a new winter wheat hybrid, not a spring variety, with a branched ear, was indeed our primary task. At present several new types of branched winter wheat are being studied and tested. Next year (1956) one of them will be issued for production tests.

Concurrently with the work mentioned above, a good deal is being done to force a wheat plant to vegetate throughout the year except for the winter period, and to produce not one but two or three grain harvests a year, as well as fodder.

All existing forms of wheat usually complete their field life when the grain ripens in the ear. We have now produced and tested types of wheat which we call grain-fodder wheats. They do not end their lives when they have been harvested for grain. They continue to develop, and produce quite a considerable fodder crop which can later be cut for hay. When wheat of this kind has been harvested for hay, it grows again and the aftermath can be used as green fodder for cattle until the first snowfall.

Grain-fodder wheats, produced from wide crossing of wheat with couch-grass, have still another practical characteristic, which alters our traditional concepts of the high-albumen content of some types of wheat.

The albumen content of wheat grain was said to fall sharply as the crop moved from east to west or from south to north. The wheats in the south-east of our country, for example, have an albumen content of over 20%, which falls to 14-16% in the non-*chernozem* areas. German wheats have a 13% albumen-content, British wheats up to 11%. This was a correct concept which corresponded to the facts. But we have now for the first time produced types of perennial and other wheats which have a grain albumen-content as high as 25% in the natural conditions of the Moscow Region. This is as high as that found in many leguminous seed plants. It has been established by analysis, moreover, that hay cut from such wheat has an average albumen content of up to 17%, which is as high as the albumen content found in the grain of the wheats grown in this area.

These grain-fodder hybrids have still another interesting characteristic. While all types of wheat ripen upwards, these hybrids ripen from above downwards, making it possible to harvest them at the moment of pre-waxy ripeness. At this time the stem and leaves of the hybrid plant remain green. When thresh-

ing such plants, dried in the field, you obtain grain and hay instead of grain and straw. If the high nutritive value of the hay of these grain-fodder hybrids is taken into account, the importance of these new types of agricultural plants becomes evident.

As a result of lengthy and difficult research work, perennial wheat forms have been produced. The first crop of this kind is No. 34085. Its development cycle relates it equally both to spring and to winter varieties, while its flowering is akin both to self-pollinating and to cross-pollinated plants. The characteristics of this type are that it is perennial, it stands well, it is drought-resistant and resistant to soil salination and to fungoid diseases. There are a number of well-known types of wheat which have similar gluten content. Besides its positive characteristics, it also has a number of negative points: it is tight in threshing, it has a ribby grain, and its greatest shortcoming is its poor showing when wintering in the open field in its second year of life.

Further selection work had to be done, and new types have now been produced which have almost eliminated the shortcomings of the first progeny of this crop. But we have not yet succeeded in increasing its resistance to wintering in the open after its first year.

An improved form of perennial wheat is No. 2. Sown experimentally in an area near Moscow (Nemchinovka), it produced a harvest two years running without being re-sown. Some plants give three and four harvests without being re-sown. This wheat is disease-resistant, bushes and stands well, is easy to thresh and produces good flour which bakes well for bread. It is now to be tested not as a perennial wheat but as an annual grain-fodder crop with two harvests a year.

Our selection experimental plots are now testing and studying new and improved forms of perennial wheat; in particular we are seeking stable high yields which can be maintained for two to three years.



WE have produced rye/couch-grass hybrids by crossing winter rye with couch-grass. The great difficulties we experienced in eliminating sterility in the hybrid in the first generation have at last been overcome. The main aim of this crossing was to produce a new form of winter rye, the grain of which would have adequate gluten, which is absent from all existing forms of rye, although present (up to 70%) in certain forms of couch-grass.

We have now succeeded in producing dozens of new perennial three-genus, rye/wheat/couch-grass hybrids in different combinations. We have thus managed to overcome the infertility of first-generation hybrids and second generations have been obtained from them.

Perennial hybrids have recently been obtained from crossing winter rye with wild forms of perennial rye, which makes possible the introduction of perennial forms of this crop into agriculture.

Our attention was drawn several years ago to a most interesting wild cereal plant, *Elymus*, popularly known as wild rye, sandy oats or wild barley. There are more than fifty varieties of this species. *Elymus* is common in the Kola peninsula, in the sandy wastes of central Asia and throughout the southern steppes of the European part of the USSR. It is a very hardy plant, and appears resistant to harsh frosts, to burning heat and to waterlogged soil. Nothing seems able to impede its development, growth and maturing. It is strong, tall and branched, with a multiple root structure which goes down deep into the soil, and its coarse leaves prevent the plant from being damaged by trampling cattle.

This plant attracted our attention when as many as 1,000 grains were counted in a single ear. It was decided to cross it with cultivated cereals (wheat, rye, barley) to transfer its extraordinary qualities by inheritance. It took several years' work to find the correct crossing method. We pollinated tens of thou-

sands of flowers in different combinations, but failed to get any positive results for a very long time. It is only in the past few years that we have succeeded in getting the first hybrids of *Elymus* (*E. arenaria* and *E. gigantea*) crossed with wheat, barley and rye.



SOME of our most interesting and promising work in hereditary approximation has been that done on hybridising arboreal with herbaceous plants.

Before our experiments, most research was done on grafting arboreal plants on arboreal and herbaceous on herbaceous. There was a most varied development in this grafting work, and an extensive range of plants was used. But it was only at the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth that vegetative grafting, thanks to the outstanding work done by Michurin, became an integral part of the basic means of scientific selection.

The first plants we took in our work were yellow acacia and pea ; we chose these two species for the following reasons : the bean family has about 12,000 varieties, including grasses, vines, bushes and trees ; there are different types of plant in this family, from dwarf grasses to giant trees.

For several years our attempts to obtain hybrid seeds were quite unsuccessful. The pollinating of tens of thousands of flowers of this variety, both artificially and naturally, produced no results. Failure to bring about direct hybridisation between yellow acacia and pea forced us to test the Michurinist method of approximate vegetative hybridisation. A good deal of very hard work went into this method of grafting, and it was for some years unsuccessful, but a few years ago we succeeded in carrying out a genuine grafting of pea with yellow acacia. Since then we have been entirely successful in grafting such plants as haricot beans, lentils and so forth on to yellow acacia.

Other such work which we have been doing concerns the cyphomandra, or tomato tree, which was grown in Sorrento and given to us by Maxim Gorky. The cyphomandra is a sub-tropical plant, a very fast-growing evergreen. In the past seven years we have succeeded in growing on it, by grafting, real tomatoes, aubergines, pepper, physalis, potatoes, thorn-apple (or datura) and other plants. All these graft very well both on the tomato tree and on the bush Mexican morel, flowering and fruiting well. The fruits gathered from annual and perennial tomato wildings are quite ordinary and their seeds do not in any way differ from those of the ordinary tomato. We got much the same picture when we crossed the flowers of cyphomandra graftings on to aubergines. Aubergines pollinated by cyphomandra produce fruits resembling the latter and considerably smaller than the former.

In the past few years we have produced an inter-species vegetative hybrid from cyphomandra and tomato, which is in essence a new type of cultivated plant. Other cyphomandra-tomato hybrids show very few type changes, but this new hybrid shows radical changes in the hereditary basis of the entire organism.

To raise the harvest yield of this hybrid, we carried out direct and back crossing with it and the tomato Suprême. As a result of sexual hybridisation a great variety in form was achieved, including families of great practical value.

Cyphomandra-tomato hybrids and individual lines of vegetative-sexual hybrids are being studied in the Stalingrad, Gribove and Adler vegetable experimental selection stations, at the Alma-Ata experimental centre of the USSR Academy of Sciences Main Botanical Gardens, and on the demonstration plot at the All-Union Agricultural Exhibition.

A number of hybrid lines, distinguished for their high yields and the high dry-matter content in their fruits, have been or are to be handed over for study to the All-Union Scientific Research Institute of the canning industry and to some selection stations.

Sexual hybridisation of the vegetative hybrid with different types of tomato results in wide crosses in an extensive process of formation, as a result of which entirely new forms arise, tree forms with broad leaves, tree forms with dissected leaves, plants with highly developed cup-shaped leaves, and so on.

Vegetative and vegetative-sexual cyphomandra-tomato hybrids are of great practical value because of their high sugar-content, their small number of pips, and their good flesh.

More recently we have begun to pay great attention to the selection of arboreal and herbaceous components from the rose-coloured and multi-coloured families. In developing this new aspect of the work we are studying questions of the preliminary vegetative approximation and subsequent hybridisation of plants belonging to different families. Some success has already been registered in this field. A successful grafting, as Michurin said, is a true indication of the kinship of the two plants grafted one upon the other. We are seeking to end not only the inability to cross plants, but also the inability to graft plants upon each other.

In studying certain fibrous wild plants, our attention was attracted by gomphocarpus, of the Asclepiadaceae, and by the oleander, of the Apocynaceae. These plants bear little resemblance to one another. Gomphocarpus is a weed found in Transcaucasia and in central Asia. It is a perennial bush-type plant, and branches well. If it is grown from seed in a hot-house it reaches as much as three feet in height, and flowers and fruits in a single year. The oleander belongs to the Mediterranean countries, where it grows extensively along the banks of rivers and irrigation canals. In the Soviet Union the oleander is cultivated to grow in the open in the sub-tropics as a decorative plant. Grafting gomphocarpus on oleander, or vice versa, has been entirely successful, and the work continues. If a way can be found to overcome the obstacles preventing inter-family hybridisation—and we are sure that such a way will be found—then indeed all our ideas on existing flora will disintegrate before the flora which await us.



MICHURINIST teaching is not a dogma, but a guide to action, directed towards producing new kinds of plants and animal breeds, and obtaining harvest yields for agricultural crops and an increase in meat and dairy produce. Michurinist teaching is creative by nature, allowing of no stagnation. It is incompatible with dogmatism. A Michurinist in practice has to approach the matter creatively, to seek new paths, work out new methods, discover and study the still-undiscovered laws of development of living nature. To be a consistent Michurinist does not mean repeating by rote quotations and formulations from Michurin's works. Such an approach could only do harm to Michurinist teaching. All Michurin's work showed and proved that the power of science lies in its continuous creative development on the basis of practice.

Slightly abridged and translated by ELEANOR FOX.

From VESTNIK AKADEMII NAUK, No. 11, 1955.



THE PLAN AND BRITISH-SOVIET TRADE

THE SIXTH five-year plan of the USSR for the years 1956-60 has one aspect of particular importance to other countries, and particularly Great Britain. It opens the possibilities of trade expansion on a scale previously unknown in East-West relations.

Huge increases in industrial output are to be achieved by introducing labour-saving devices "in conformity with the best that has been achieved at home and abroad". The rapid introduction of "the latest achievements of Soviet and foreign science and engineering" is made an obligation of all party and economic organisations.

This is why, while the most precise instructions have been laid down for expansion in the various home industries, it was possible for the Deputy Minister for Foreign Trade to tell the General Council of the Scottish TUC, in October 1955, that his country was prepared to import equipment for the power, electrical engineering, oil, mining, transport and other industries, as well as large quantities of consumer goods.

The agricultural section of the plan provides for a total output of 180,000,000 tons of grain, as compared with an average of just over 120,000,000 tons five years ago, and a substantial rise since then. Output in 1955 was 157,000,000 tons gross (estimated at 129,000,000 tons net by the UN *Economic Survey of Europe*, 1955). Raw cotton output is to go up 50%, flax 35%, oil 90%, timber 34%—and in all these traditional items of export Soviet output in 1955 was already several times larger than in Tsarist days.

If it be remembered that in the peak years of Tsardom 1909-13 the gross output averaged 79,000,000 tons, with an export of 9,000,000 or 10,000,000 tons annually, anyone can see what an enormous margin there is for trade today, even allowing for a 25% larger population. Of course, the exports of Soviet products will not come merely for the asking: the Soviet government has made it clear more than once that it will not release commodities of which other countries have need unless those countries in their turn cease discriminating against the USSR in their exports of products (not war material) which the USSR requires.

This is the background of the directive in the new plan: "Consistently and firmly upholding the possibility of, and the need for, the peaceful co-existence of countries with different social and political systems, the Soviet State will also strive to expand trade with other countries on the basis of mutual advantage."

It is worth recalling, in this connection, that as long ago as 1949—when Soviet output of agricultural produce was far smaller than today—the Economic Commission for Europe, in its annual report, wrote that "under conditions where production and consumption are largely directed by conscious planning, no large exportable surpluses are likely to emerge *unless assured outlets have been established by prior agreement*". The Soviet Union and the countries associated with it, the report pointed out, "would not deliberately plan to devote a large part of their current production and investment to the building up of surpluses beyond their foreseeable requirements *unless export markets were assured*". Since 1949 the output of all Soviet traditional export commodities has considerably increased; but the USSR has no difficulty in disposing of them, and what the E.C.E. wrote seven years ago still holds good.

The plan lays down a far larger production of consumer goods than ever before in Russian history—nearly 8,000,000,000 yards of cotton fabrics (an increase of 23% on the 1955 figure), nearly 400,000,000 yards of woollen fabrics (a 45% increase), nearly 34,000,000 clocks and watches (over 70%

above the 1955 output), 455,000,000 pairs of footwear (half as much again as last year), over 10,000,000 radio and television sets and over 3,750,000 household sewing machines (in each case well over double the 1955 output), and so on. These of course are very substantial increases, and disposing of them will mean, it is estimated, an expansion of retail trade by 50%.

But compared with what the Soviet public could consume they are still not adequate. It is noteworthy that the increases in retail sales planned for the categories of goods mentioned (and for many others) are in each case larger than the increases in output—30% in the case of cotton fabrics, 100% for woollens, footwear 65%, and so on. This is possible because the Soviet Union has long-term trade treaties with the People's Democracies, under which (in exchange for its own capital goods, minerals and raw materials) it is importing large supplementary quantities of their high-quality consumer goods, as well as the output of their new heavy industries, raw materials, and so on.

If it could import consumer goods from countries like Great Britain too, it would gladly do so. Mr. Kabanov, Minister for Foreign Trade, made this perfectly clear to a group of British business men in Moscow in February 1954. In addition to an extensive programme of capital goods—ships of many kinds, railway and electric power equipment, floating cranes, heavy engineering machinery, instruments, and so on—to the total value of 3,000,000,000 roubles (about £270,000,000), for delivery in 1955-57, the Soviet Union could purchase raw materials, foodstuffs and manufactured consumer goods, for delivery in the same years, to a value of about £135,000,000.*

For purposes of comparison, it may be mentioned that in 1955 British exports of all kinds to the USSR amounted—owing to the artificial restrictions imposed by the Board of Trade—to no more than about £30,000,000 against a possible £135,000,000 offered by Mr. Kabanov. The difference of £100,000,000 would have meant a reduction of over 11% in Britain's adverse trade balance (£860,000,000) last year.

The importance of developing this commerce, however, goes far beyond the question of trade balances. Without the elimination of discriminatory barriers and obstacles to East-West trade, Mr. Molotov stated on November 14 at Geneva (and the statement was not seriously disputed) that "there can be no normal development of contacts between East and West". "The development of unhampered trade would signify a further lessening of tension between the countries of the East and the West", he added on November 15. But the Western Ministers, in set terms, declared that they were "not willing to negotiate" on this subject (Mr. Macmillan's speech on November 14), on the plea that "strategic controls" were involved: a formula which begs the whole question, as a glance at the substantial list of proposed Soviet imports mentioned earlier would show. (It was published in the *Board of Trade Journal* on March 6, 1954.)

Be that as it may, the fact remains that the Soviet Union is not only itself exporting, in very large quantities, the very capital goods of which (in the imagination of some foreign officials) it is being deprived by the restrictions in question; but it is prepared for a further large expansion of its foreign trade, already four times as great as in pre-war days. The sixth five-year plan contains convincing evidence of this.

Overseas cargoes are to be doubled by 1960. Over 1,500,000 tons are to be added to general cargo and tanker tonnage. Ports like Odessa, Nikolayev, Novorossiisk, Leningrad, Murmansk and Vladivostok are to be reconstructed and developed, and others built. Existing shipyards are to be modernised, and

* Since this article was written, the Soviet Union has offered (in the absence of trade restrictions and discrimination) to buy machinery, equipment and ships in the United Kingdom, with manufactured goods and raw materials, to a total value of £800,000,000—£1,000,000,000 in 1956-60, i.e. a yearly average of £160,000,000—£200,000,000.

a new yard is to be started. Port mechanisation and warehouse accommodation are to be greatly increased.

In what direction are the cargoes to go? That depends entirely on the interest and common sense of each individual country with which the Soviet Union has relations. One thing is certain, that in its own constantly expanding internal market, in its relations with other socialist countries elsewhere in the world, it has adequate outlets for all its surpluses if need be.

The offers recorded in the first week of 1956 alone are a sufficient reminder that there are many non-socialist countries ready to take Soviet products: various entire factories, with agricultural machinery and road building (Yemen); equipment and plans for two chemical factories and a power plant, expanding three mines, and atomic research (Yugoslavia); iron and steel goods of various qualities, over and above the agreement to build a steel works of 1,000,000 tons capacity (India); a petroleum refinery (Syria); equipment for the oil and other industries, machine tools, motor vehicles, agricultural machinery, together with finished and semi-finished goods like timber, pulp, oil, rolled steel, cement, asbestos and chemicals (Latin America). In exchange the Soviet Union accepts, or has offered to accept, the traditional export commodities of the countries concerned. Just as it can adapt its yearly economic plans to provide the industrial exports required under long-term trade agreements which it has signed, so the Soviet Union can accelerate the development of particular sections of its economy—notably the supply of consumer goods—with the help of imports from Asian, African and Latin-American countries, without throwing its plans out of balance.

Those who still seek to injure British-Soviet trade by dragging in political prejudice may choose to call such Soviet trade with the underdeveloped countries (which serves to develop their economy independently of foreign investment) “disruption by peaceful means” (*The Economist*, January 28, 1956). But such abuse will not stop trade, it will not weaken the effect of the sixth five-year plan in developing Soviet competitive power, nor will it dispose of the question of whether this country’s interests would not be better served by peaceful trade and economic co-operation with the Soviet Union rather than by increasingly ineffective attempts to discriminate against it.

Andrew Rothstein

SCR Library, Exhibition and Lecture Services

The Library is general and scientific, with a holding of over 8,000 Russian books and several thousand English books and translations, and current journals and newspapers.

Library hours, for reference and loan facilities, are 1 p.m. to 7 p.m. on Monday, Wednesday and Friday, and 1 p.m. to 6 p.m. on Tuesday and Thursday. There is a postal loan service on refund of postage. Facilities include borrowing three books at a time for a period of one month. Special loans, for exhibition or research, by arrangement.

The Exhibition Department has an extensive library of photographs, art books, film-strips, slides and other visual aids, available to lecturers, schools and interested bodies. Catalogue on request.

The Lecture Service offers the information and knowledge of SCR specialist members—many of whom have recently visited the USSR—to schools, societies, professional organisations, and so on.

SCR Notes

Soviet Guests in Britain

THE SOCIETY was happy to welcome as its guests for three weeks in November 1955 three leading personalities from Soviet scientific and cultural life in the persons of Academician Nikolai Tsitsin (Director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Central Botanical Gardens in Moscow and Director of the All-Union Agricultural Exhibition), selectionist and geneticist; Professor Nikolai Gudzy (of Moscow University), specialist on Tolstoy; and Mr. Nikolai Zhukov (Chairman of the Foreign Commission of the USSR Union of Soviet Artists), graphic artist.

Academician Tsitsin. His anticipated programme had to be sharply curtailed owing to his ill-health throughout his stay in Britain. After a brief visit to Scotland, the Society arranged for him to visit Nottingham, where he was received and entertained by the head of the Wheatcroft Rose Nurseries; he met members of the staff of the agricultural and horticultural laboratories of Boots, the big pharmaceutical firm; he lunched with members of the staff of the University in his own speciality, met them for informal discussion, and in the evening answered many questions from an audience of 150, consisting of staff and students; he also spoke for the local SCR at an informal meeting. In London he spoke and answered questions at a Soviet science symposium (together with Professor C. F. Powell and Dr. S. Lilley), arranged by the Society and attended by about 300 people. Mr. Tsitsin having met Mr. Antony Nugent, Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Agriculture and Food, when the latter visited the Soviet Union, Mr. Nugent was kind enough to invite the Academician to lunch at the House of Commons and to help arrange his programme between November 22 and 29. He visited the offices of the Royal Agricultural Society and the Royal Botanical Gardens at Kew, where he met the Director, Sir Edward Salisbury, and was taken round the gardens and lunched with the Deputy Director, Dr. Bor. Mr. Tsitsin spent a day at the Rothamsted Experimental Station and a day in Cambridge, where he visited the Institute of Plant Breeding and was received by the Director, who had visited the USSR shortly before, and other agricultural research centres in the city. He also visited the East Malling Fruit Research Station and Darwin's home at Downe in Kent. He was most cordially received wherever he went, and he expressed the desire to return as soon as possible to Britain for a longer period of time to study.

Professor Gudzy visited Oxford, Cambridge, Birmingham, Stratford-on-Avon and the London School of Slavonic Studies. At Oxford a programme was arranged for him by Professor Konovalov and his colleagues. The Professor lectured at the Taylorian Institute, dined at High Table in New College with the Vice-Chancellor, and visited colleges and libraries. At Cambridge he was equally warmly welcomed and entertained by the deputy head of the Russian Department and his colleagues (Dr. Hill being away at the time), both at the colleges and in private homes. He lectured on Tolstoy to the Slavonic Society. His programme at the London School of Slavonic Studies was arranged by Dr. Malnick, and he was entertained to lunch by the director of the school.

Professor Gudzy was received at Stratford-on-Avon by Professor and Mrs. Allardyce Nicol and had an opportunity of visiting the Memorial Theatre. One of the best lectures it has ever been our good fortune to hear was given by Professor Gudzy on Tolstoy for members of the Society at SCR House in London.

Mr. Nikolai Zhukov at the beginning of his stay emphasised his desire to have plenty of time free to draw, and it was thus not possible to arrange as many meetings with British artists as we or he would have liked. He answered questions and lectured for the Society in York, Bradford, Birmingham and London. At Birmingham he was entertained by Mr. Douglas Jones, Principal of the School of Architecture, and visited the annual exhibition of schools of art and the City Art Gallery. A lively informal meeting was arranged for him privately. At Stoke-on-Trent he was received and entertained to luncheon by the Lord Mayor and visited the City Art Gallery and School of Arts and Crafts with Mr. C. Bemrose, Curator of the Art Gallery, who visited the Soviet Union under the auspices of the Society in August 1955.

In Southampton he lectured to students at the School of Arts and had an opportunity of visiting the City Art Gallery and meeting members of the local SCR committee, who arranged for him a most pleasant and useful programme.

A small exhibition of reproductions of Mr. Zhukov's work was shown at SCR House and a lecture followed in the evening.

Mr. Zhukov also visited many exhibitions and private and public art galleries.

He, like Academician Tsitsin and Professor Gudzy, expressed his desire to return to

Britain for a longer period in his special capacity, and the Society hopes this may be possible.

Mr. Igor Moiseyev. We were fortunate in welcoming the founder and artistic director of the Soviet State Folk Dance Ensemble, which had so successful a run in London, as our guest at the Society, where he lectured on *Ballet and Folk Dance* to an audience of eighty and answered questions.

Mr. Keres and Mr. Ragozin. From December 22, 1955, to January 9, 1956, the two Soviet Chess Grandmasters visited Britain as guests of the SCR, and undertook an extensive tour of simultaneous displays and lectures.

The SCR received the most friendly co-operation from the president, secretary, treasurer and executive members of the British Chess Federation, officials of the National Chess Centre, the match captains of the Home Counties teams and the chess committees in different parts of Britain. There was a good press, the local press being especially cordial.

Between them Mr. Keres and Mr. Ragozin visited Blackpool, Brighton and Ilford, where the Mayor gave them an official welcome; and Glasgow, Leeds, Manchester, Bristol, Harrow, Southampton and Leicester, where they were received by leading local figures. In London they gave two joint displays at the National Chess Centre, and on the last Sunday of their visit were joined by Mr. Taimanov and Mr. Korchnoi, who had been playing at Hastings, which enabled the SCR to present simultaneously four of the leading chess players in the world—an unprecedented event in Britain. At every display during the three weeks they each played twenty opponents. Apart from hundreds of spectators, no less than 400 leading British county and club players were able to play against a Soviet master. Of special interest was a display given by Mr. Ragozin against twenty specially selected boys from London and the Home Counties. In addition Mr. Keres lectured to the 180 participants in this year's London boys' tournament, as well as giving a lecture at the SCR. Both guests spent some days at the Hastings tournament.

Although Soviet players have taken part in the Hastings tournament for the last three years, and the Society has sometimes been able to arrange an additional programme for them, this tour by Mr. Keres and Mr. Ragozin was the first time that Soviet chess players had come into contact with British chess all over the country. The Society has received most enthusiastic letters from the towns they visited, urging further similar visits, and a number of inquiries have come from bodies in other parts of the country, asking to be included in a similar tour for 1956.

The Grandmasters were accompanied by their wives and had many opportunities of accepting private hospitality. Both had visited Britain before; they stressed how much they appreciated the great warmth of their welcome and how much greater had been their opportunities for getting to know Britain and the British people. The Society hopes very much to be able to arrange a similar tour in the near future.

Professor Petrov, Mrs. Usova, Mrs. Vlasova, Mrs. Sakulina and Mr. Zaporozhets. Professor Petrov, Director of the Institute of Method of the RSFSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, and his colleagues (accompanied most ably by Mr. M. Sagetlyan as their interpreter), came to Britain from February 4—25, 1956, as guests of the SCR Education Section Committee, which, together with SCR staff, arranged a most extensive programme during their stay. Apart from visiting Liverpool, Leeds, Cambridge, Leicester and Southampton, these distinguished educationists (specialising in method, pre-school education, defectology, child psychology and art education for children) visited many institutions and centres connected with their own specialities and were given the opportunity of many informal discussions with their British colleagues and an opportunity to lecture on Soviet work in their respective fields.

The programme for London and other cities was arranged with the kind co-operation of the Education Department of the London County Council; the Nursery School Association; the Society for Education through Art; the Institute of Education, the Borough of Tottenham Education Office; Dr. Kirman of the Fountain Hospital, London; Mrs. Harrison of the Jeffrye Museum; Councillor Mrs. Wormald and the Liverpool SCR; Professor Niblett and the Leeds SCR; the Cambridge Institute of Education, the Cambridge Chief Education Officer, and Mrs. Minorsky; Mr. Brian Simon of Leicester; Professor Wagner, Mr. F. L. Freeman (Chief Education Officer) and Mr. Alan Merson (SCR), all of Southampton.

Space does not permit a day-by-day analysis of this visit, but we feel it important to record our most cordial thanks to all these bodies and individuals who enabled our guests to see a considerable section of British education thoroughly, as well as to lecture in their own specialities. We feel most strongly that such personal contact can lead to further exchanges, and further exchanges mean more factual material being made available to both British and Soviet educationists. A detailed report of their programme is available for consultation by members of the Society at the SCR.

Professor Sergei Golunsky. Professor Golunsky visited Britain through the Legal Section of the Soviet Society for Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries (VOKS), at the invitation of the SCR Legal Section committee, from February 6—24, 1956.

This distinguished Soviet specialist in criminal law procedure was the first Soviet lawyer ever to visit Britain for a lecture tour, and the Society's pride in having pioneered this visit is enhanced by the hope that he will be but the first of many lecturers in various fields we shall be glad to welcome as our guests in Britain.

Professor Golunsky commanded respect and admiration wherever he went for his superb command of the English language, his lucidity in explanation, his comprehensive grasp and detailed knowledge of his subject, his brilliance and directness in answering questions, and his charming personality.

Apart from lecturing on *Criminal Procedure* at SCR House in London, he was the guest, officially and informally, of Lord Evershed, Master of the Rolls; of Sir Theobald Mathew, Director of Public Prosecutions; of the Magistrates' Association (where he lectured on criminal procedure); of the Vice-Principal of Birmingham University; and of the Deans of the Faculties of Law at Birmingham and Southampton. He was the guest of Sir Arthur Comyns Carr, Q.C.; Elwyn Jones, Q.C., M.P.; the Rt. Hon. Clement Davies, Q.C., M.P.; Henry Usborne, M.P.; and of the President of our Society, Mr. D. N. Pritt, Q.C., and Mrs. Pritt.

Professor Golunsky visited the Court of Appeal and the Old Bailey (where he met the Recorder and Common Serjeant and members of the Bar). He dined at High Table at Cambridge as the guest of Professor E. J. Hamson, had an interview with Sir Ronald Howe, Deputy Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police (spending an afternoon at New Scotland Yard), and at the House of Commons attended a dinner, organised by the Parliamentary Association for World Government, in honour of Bertrand Russell, whom he met privately also. Lord Silkin, Lord Beveridge and Lord Boyd Orr also attended this dinner.

He had an opportunity of meeting Dr. Dennis Carroll, President of the International Society of Criminology, and also visited the Institute for the Study and Treatment of Delinquency, Wormwood Scrubbs, the offices of the Director of Public Prosecutions, and a solicitor's office (H. W. Thompson). He had an opportunity of meeting W. C. Norton, President of the Law Society, and T. G. Wood, Secretary of the Law Society. Lord Chorley took the chair when Professor Golunsky lectured at the Haldane Society on the work of Soviet lawyers. He visited the Juvenile Court, Stamford House, Goldhawk Road, London, W.12, and lectured to staff and students at the Law Faculty of King's College, London.

Our most cordial thanks are due to all the distinguished members of the British legal profession who found time to meet, talk with and entertain our visitor, and we hope this will be the beginning of many more exchanges between the lawyers of our two countries. Much time and trouble was taken by Mr. Dudley Collard and Mr. D. T. Veall, of the Society's Legal Section; and Mr. C. Ashleigh is to be thanked for his unobtrusive but most necessary shepherding of the Professor through the intricacies of British transport and hotels.

Meetings and other Events

Science. A special "invitation only" symposium was held in the anatomy theatre of University College for London scientists. Papers were read by Professor Wood (Aberystwyth—geology), Professor 'Espinasse (Hull—biology) and Professor Wynne-Jones (Newcastle—chemistry). All three had visited the USSR in September 1955.

Medicine. Organised by the SCR Medical Section in the board room of the South West Metropolitan Regional Hospital Board. Papers were read by Dr. Gottlieb (general practitioner) and Dr. Burton (Medical Director, Central Council for Health Education). The chair was taken by Mr. R. Sargood, J.P. (former M.P. and member of the Regional Hospital Board).

Popular Science. Held in the Caxton Hall. Short papers by Academician Tsitsin on agriculture, Professor Powell on atomic energy, and Dr. Lilley on automation, and slides of photographs shown by Mr. Allan Cash. Questions and answers.

Educational Theory in the USSR. *College of Preceptors.* Chairman: Professor J. A. Lauwerys. Speakers: Professor Petrov, T. A. Vlasova, A. V. Zaporozhets. Questions and answers.

Annual General Meeting and Dinner. A well-attended gathering, with excellent discussion. Postal voting for the Executive Committee took place most successfully. (The list of new officers appears on the inside front cover of this issue.) The meeting was followed by a dinner at the House of Commons, by the kindness of Dr. Barnett Stross, M.P. The dinner was attended by 130 people, distinguished in many walks of British

scientific and cultural life, in the presence of the guest of honour, the Chargé d'Affaires of the USSR Embassy, and other senior members of his staff.

St. Petersburg Fair. A musical entertainment by children for children was arranged on December 17, 1955, at the SCR, with the kind co-operation and hard work of the headmistress, staff and children of the Woodlands Park junior girls' school, London, N., and by permission of the local education authority. Some sixty children and adults enjoyed this unusual form of Christmas entertainment.

Soviet Children's Paintings. An exhibition presented by the *Sunday Pictorial* in co-operation with the SCR was on show for four weeks in December 1955 at the gallery of the Royal Water Colour Society in London. The exhibition is now on tour and will visit six other British cities for a month at a time. British children's paintings will be sent in May 1956 for a year's tour of the Soviet Union, in exchange.

New Year's Eve. The traditional party at the SCR, London, was supported by some 250 members and their friends, and was a most successful event.

Mstislav Rostropovich. The Society was proud to present one of the Soviet Union's finest 'cellists of the younger generation to an appreciative audience of over 2,000 at the Royal Festival Hall, London, on March 3, 1956. The concert was held under the patronage of H.E. the Soviet Ambassador, and we were pleased to welcome a party from the USSR Embassy, headed by the Chargé d'Affaires, Mr. N. D. Belokhovstikov. Mr. Rostropovich played under the baton of Hugo Rignold, with the Royal Philharmonic Orchestra, and the appreciative criticism of the leading musical critics in Britain has more than justified this not inconsiderable venture by the Society. We hope he will return as our guest in a year's time to further triumphs, and our thanks are due to him for having come and to Mr. A. Borsdorf for having so ably promoted this concert.

We recall with pride that the return of David Oistrakh to Britain in February of this year, to a phenomenally successful concert tour, was in no small measure the result of the Society having had him as its guest in November 1954.

Other events. Our successful piano and 'cello recital by Margaret Good and William Pleeth on January 22 was followed on Sunday, April 22, by a Recital for Voice and Flute. We were most fortunate in obtaining the services of Constance Shacklock (mezzo-soprano) and Alex Murray (flute) for a programme of Russian and English music.

Friday, April 20, at 8 p.m. The first of a course of six fortnightly lectures on *The Work of Ivan Pavlov*. Fees, 10s. for entire course or 2s. per session (members and students 7s. 6d. and 1s. 6d. respectively. For details see page 60).

Wednesday, May 9, at 8.0 p.m.: a symposium on Soviet Architecture. The Society welcomed to Britain, for three weeks from April 20, a group of four distinguished Soviet architects, town planners and civil engineers, headed by Karo Alabyan, member of the USSR Academy of Architecture.

Advance Information. August. A summer school on board a Soviet ship, during the voyage to and from Leningrad, is being arranged for SCR members. Places are severely limited, and the school is already booked up.

September. A symposium on *Soviet and British Writing* will probably be held, with the participation of leading British and Soviet writers. British writers will answer questions put by their Soviet colleagues on British writing, while Soviet writers in Moscow, on the same evening, will answer questions put by British writers on Soviet writing. Each capital will have an invitation public meeting and the proceedings at each will be recorded and subsequently published. Further details to follow.

Secretary. Owing to the resignation of Mr. K. W. Watkins, the Executive Committee appointed Mrs. Eleanor Fox as Secretary in February 1956.



Book Reviews

RUSSIAN LITERATURE AND THE STUDENT

Ivan Turgenev: Rudin. Edited with an introduction by Galina Stilman. (New York: Columbia University Press; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 28/-)

Turgenev's Fathers and Sons. A stressed text, with introduction and notes by E. R. Sands. (Cambridge University Press, 8/6.)

Korolenko's Siberia: Three short stories by V. G. Korolenko. Translated from the Russian by R. F. Christian. (Liverpool University Press, 10/6.)

DESPITE TURGENEV'S outstandingly superior sense of form and æsthetic fitness, there is much to relate his work to that of Korolenko as a master of the *novella* or short story, though Korolenko's first and best-remembered tale, *Makar's Dream*, did not appear until 1883, the year of Turgenev's death. Both enjoyed describing the humour and the saddening mystery of life with the intermittent interlusive aids of poetry and a minutely observed nature, and both were forerunners of later Russian developments in social thinking—the one with calm melancholy and the other with an equally serene cheerfulness. These three books may therefore conveniently be discussed together. They are significant too of that welcome florescence of interest in Russian literature—both amateur and academic—which seems to be beginning with the recently vivifying Anglo-Soviet relationships.

Mrs. Stilman's edition of *Rudin* is intended especially for American students of Russian in their third year at the university, and as a result of her experience as a teacher has been slightly abridged and textually adjusted to their needs; nor does she tell us upon what text her version is based. She adds a simply and efficiently written introduction in Russian; and there is a translation of most of the difficult words and idioms at the foot of each page as well as a vocabulary at the end. It does not assume much knowledge of Russian or much general education in its readers; but it is well produced if expensive.

Mr. Sand's edition of *Fathers and Sons* is a much more scholarly as well as useful book from a British point of view. It manages to be very cheap in price by photo-lithographing the Russian text of the OGIZ Moscow/Leningrad edition of 1948, prefixing a stimulating but economical introduction and concluding with a few pages of excellent notes on allusions and real difficulties in the text. He assumes that the student is capable of working with a dictionary and has mastered the elements of grammar, as Mrs. Stilman does not. The Russian stresses are added to the text

from the best authorities. Mr. Sands discusses the question of the origin of the term *Nihilism* (*nigilizm*) in *Fathers and Sons* with interest. It is worth noting perhaps that the fact that Turgenev, and not Katkov, originated the term in its generally accepted meaning has been established recently by A. I. Batyuto in an essay in the *Izvestiya Akademii Nauk, Otd. Lit. i Yazyka* (Tom XII Vypusk 6, 1953).

Korolenko's stories, apart from *Makar's Dream* in the now scarcely accessible translation of Stepanyak and Westall, are virtually unknown in Britain, so that these admirable renderings of three of his best tales of life in Siberia and its prison settlements seventy or eighty years ago are especially welcome. Mr. Christian's introductory matter and appendix supply vivid and careful background material on Korolenko and his times; and here, as well as in his method of rendering, he addresses alike the amateur with no Russian and the student who has some first-hand knowledge. The translation is at once reasonably accurate and conservative of the flavour of Korolenko's peculiar imaginative and evocative qualities. Mr. Christian shows himself to be a scholar not unacquainted with recent literature on his subject; but a bibliographical note would have been a useful addition to his book. Korolenko's vivid and sympathetic presentation of the life of the native Yakuts and their Russian colleagues is the most exact and yet imaginative picture we have, and the British student of Russian social history will enjoy comparing Korolenko's *Siberia* with that so ably portrayed in Soviet novels and films in our time. The three stories included are *Makar's Dream*, *Yashka* and *Killer*.

These three books suggest the improvement in Russian studies which is taking shape on both sides of the Atlantic. The Columbia University's series of *Slavic Studies* presided over by Professor Ernest Simmons, in which this edition of *Rudin* is included, has already established itself as a valuable academic force; and Cambridge and Oxford have both recently shown some much-needed activity in Russian publication. But this scholarly making available in English of an almost unknown classical Russian author's tales of Siberia by Liverpool University merits a very special commendation. Korolenko, as being in a sense a Ukrainian writer, has received much attention in the Soviet Union since the celebrations of the 300th anniversary of Russia's reunion with the Ukraine in 1954, and Mr. Christian's choice of *Korolenko's Siberia* for that year was particularly appropriate.

C. L. WRENN.

OXFORD SLAVONIC PAPERS

Oxford Slavonic Papers, Vol. 5 (1954). Ed. S. Konovalov. (Clarendon Press, 1955, pp. 144, with two plates, 12/6.)

IN his new volume, Professor Konovalov continues the publication of State papers on Russia—this time of an entertaining “Relation of the Empire and State of Russia”, written (probably in 1631) by Captain Thomas Chamberlayne, with the aim of persuading Charles I to take advantage of Russia’s weakness (“putt in his foote by way of assistance”), if the King of Poland should beat the Russian Emperor in an imminent war with Poland, “which I verylie thinke that hee will goe nigh to doe”. An English protectorate over Russia would bring the King new revenues of £2,000,000 and his “Visroye” could raise another £2,000,000 for the upkeep of an army.

Mr. D. P. Costello publishes some diplomatic correspondence between Griboyedov and the British Chargé d’Affaires at Teheran in 1820; and Miss N. Gorodetzky an interesting study of Zinaida Alexandrovna Volkonsky (1791-1862), literary hostess in Moscow in Pushkin’s day, and later a convert to Roman Catholicism. There is a review of recent Soviet works on linguistics by Prof. B. D. Unbegaun: a collection of forty-one sonnets by Vyacheslav Ivanov; and the continuation of an account of glagolitic MS in the Bodleian.

Professor Vernadsky contributes a painstaking survey of documents on the death of the Tsarevich Dimitri, youngest son of Ivan IV; and Mr. O. Obolensky a laudatory review of Professor Vernadsky’s books on ancient and medieval Russian history, which calls for some comment. Professor Vernadsky, who teaches Russian history at Yale, is a well-known exponent of the theory that the history of the eastern Slavs in the Middle Ages has to be looked at continuously through the prism of who were their “overlords” and under whose “influence” they fell: Sarmatians, ancient Greek colonists, Khazars, Scandinavians, Byzantium, the Mongols, and so forth. This obsession, evidently shared by Mr. Obolensky, leads him again and again to fantastic conclusions—such as the denial that the social order of Kievan Rus (at least in its last 150 years) was essentially feudal; despite a mass of evidence gathered in recent years, such as that summarised by B. D. Grekov in the first volume of his *Krestyane na Rusi*.

Professor Vernadsky’s (and seemingly Mr. Obolensky’s) strictures as to what constituted feudalism depend entirely on ignoring those differences from country to country, and indeed from century to century, in the top structure of feudal society, which were first pointed out by Maitland seventy years ago—but which do not alter the essence. And the essence has been well formulated by Lady Stenton (whose husband’s picture of the approach to feudal-

ism in Anglo-Saxon England shows that eleventh-century Russia, in some respects, was more feudalised than this country): that the feudal system, from the biggest lords to holders of a fraction of a knight’s fee, was “dependent entirely on what could be wrung from the land by the men sitting on it”. And, from duke to knight, they wrung their income not directly from the land, but from the labour of the peasant, more or less unfree, under their control. Feudal Russia in the twelfth century differed somewhat in organisation from feudal England, but not in that respect.

Again, it is surprising to find Mr. Obolensky asserting that Soviet scholars do not directly tackle the problem of the effects of Mongol rule on Russia, confining themselves to criticism of their predecessors. Even of Grekov and Yakubovsky’s *Zolotaya Orda* (1950) this is not entirely true; it is certainly not true of B. A. Rybakov’s *Remeslo Drevnei Rusi* (1948) or of volumes I and II of the *Ocherki Istorii SSSR* (1953).

A.R.

INVALUABLE SERIES OF RUSSIAN TEXTS

A.S. Pushkin. Tales of the Late Ivan Petrovich Belkin. Ed. Unbegaun. 7/6.

Ivan Turgenev. Poems in Prose (in Russian and English). Ed. Mazon. 7/6.

Russian Prose Reader, I: XIXth Century Writers. Ed. Konovalov and Seeley. 7/6.

Russian Prose Reader, II: XIXth and XXth Century Writers. Ed. Filits and Wyzotsky. 7/6.

Russian Poetry Reader, I: XVIIIth and XIXth Century Lyrics. Ed. Lavrin. 12/6. (Basil Blackwell.)

THIS SERIES of Russian texts, with Professor S. Konovalov as general editor (some of which have already been available for several years), is invaluable to the student of Russian who has reached the stage of tackling and enjoying Russian literature, but who still needs help on the way, help such as dictionaries and grammars fail to provide.

In prose, the content ranges from Pushkin’s *Tales of Belkin*, famous now, though not when first published, as a landmark in the history of Russian realistic prose, with touches of delightful irony on the prose fashions of his time; thence, through extracts from the great nineteenth-century novelists in the first Prose Reader, to shorter extracts from lesser-known prose writers of the last century, such as S. Aksakov, Leskov and Korolenko, to short stories or representative passages from various authors of our own day, including Leonov, Sholokhov, Zoshchenko, Grossman, Simonov, and one of Ehrenburg’s impassioned war-time articles.

The shortness of the passages inevitably induces at times a feeling of being left in the air, though most have been so selected

that they have a considerable degree of completeness and climax. The student is given a good opportunity to discover which styles he can best cope with, and he would not feel a hopeless dunce if he found Leonov, for example, difficult at first. Turgenev's *Poems in Prose* have the translation by Constance Garnett alongside, and the student of style can find here much interesting material; the content must, however, prove rather unsatisfying to those who prefer the Turgenev of *Fathers and Sons* and *On the Eve*.

The Poetry Reader includes the works of no less than fifty poets, many chosen with a view to shortness and accessibility to the English reader. With a useful foreword, it provides an admirable introduction to the understanding and enjoyment of Russian poetry.

All the texts are accented and annotated; the two Prose Readers are provided not only with vocabularies, but also with notes on the mysteries of noun accentuation and the use of particles and diminutives. Both students and teachers will wish for further texts to be added to this series; the supply in Russian is very scanty as compared with those available in other European languages.

C. E. SIMMONDS.

SIXTEENTH-CENTURY PAMPHLETEERING

The Correspondence between Prince A. M. Kurbsky and Tsar Ivan IV of Russia, 1564-1579. Edited, with a translation and notes, by J. L. I. Fennell. (Cambridge University Press, 35/-.)

THE SIXTEENTH century was fertile in royal pamphleteering. Forty years before Ivan IV launched his letters in defence of autocracy against his renegade and émigré vassal Andrei Kurbsky, Henry VIII of England had written a book against Luther; twenty years after the end of the correspondence between Tsar and boyar, James VI of Scotland wrote *Basilicon Doron* to prove that the king must rule the Church, and *The True Law of Free Monarchy* to vindicate royal despotism. Ivan's writings, at least as much as any others of the kind, have (as the editor writes) "long been recognised as one of the most important historical documents of sixteenth-century Russia". Hitherto his letters and Kurbsky's replies have been available only in Russian, which most British historians cannot read, or in a German edition not easily come by. Now the student, whether of Russian history or of political ideas, has them available in a convenient form, produced by the Cambridge University Press with its customary elegance, the original text and the English translation running parallel throughout.

Ivan IV champions autocracy in the interests of defence against external foes, of whom feudal Russia had plenty. The monarch must not be "ruled by his own

servants"—and the Tsar speaks disparagingly of those who are. He denounces the abuses of the system (which his government had abolished in the fifties) when the Tsar's power was farmed out to great nobles like Kurbsky, "governors and viceroys" over cities and territories, and "what destruction was wrought as a result of this". This indirect appeal for the sympathy of the lesser nobility, holding land by personal service to the Tsar, and for that of the merchants interested in peace and quiet—Ivan actually invokes their testimony to the destructive activities of the great feudatories—has its echo in English history. So have Kurbsky's denunciations of the Tsar's servants as "vagabonds", "children of darkness" and "toadies", who have driven out the "men of eminence", "noble and highborn", "strong in Israel".

In that age political pamphlets had to draw copiously on the Scriptures and the writings of the fathers to reinforce their argument. Ivan the Terrible followed this practice, and the result does not make the easiest reading. But the struggles for power within the feudal class that ruled Russia were too close and too real to allow politics to be obscured for long in the letters on either side.

The editor's historical notes are conscientious and full, on such matters as the personal fate of this or that noble. If they nevertheless create the impression of being tinged with the traditional foreigner's sympathy for Kurbsky, it is apparently because Mr. Fennell's interest does not extend to the economic and social issues involved in the struggle (mentioned only in one or two out of many footnotes). With his evident concern for accuracy, it is a pity that he should have placed the seventh-century Bulgars "on the northern shores of the Black Sea" (p. 51); their location between the eastern shores of the Sea of Azov, the Don and the Kuban is well attested.

A.R.

PAVLOVA SYMPOSIUM

Pavlova: A Biography. Ed. A. H. Franks. (Burke Publishing Co., 12/6.)

ALTHOUGH this book is called "a biography", it is in fact a symposium by several authors. The most valuable excerpts are those from Fokine, and the "Pages of My Life" by Pavlova herself. A biographical sketch by Mr. Franks is interesting, but his views on the divergence between Pavlova's aims and Diaghilev's are not quite correct.

Mr. Franks says: "Pavlova was more dedicated to ballet than Diaghilev . . . with the accent on the dance." The truth is that Diaghilev subordinated the dancer to his preferred arts of painting, décor and music, whereas Pavlova sacrificed ballet as an ensemble in favour of her beautiful solo dances. Mr. Franks's assertion that

STUDY COURSE
Pavlovian
Physiology and Psychology

SIX LECTURES

FRIDAY, APRIL 20

Introduction.

Biographical Film: *Academician Pavlov*

FRIDAY, MAY 4

***Conditioned Reflexes.* Dr. L. Crome**

FRIDAY, MAY 18

***The Brain and the Body.* Dr. Angus MacPherson**

FRIDAY, JUNE 1

Pavlovian Physiology and Psychology.

Dr. M. Shapiro

FRIDAY, JUNE 15

Pavlovian Physiology and Psychiatry.

Dr. B. H. Kirman

FRIDAY, JUNE 29

Concluding Discussion.

Film: *Applications of Pavlovian Work*

ALL LECTURES AT 8 P.M. AT 14 KENSINGTON SQUARE, W.8

Admission to each lecture 2/- (SCR members and students 1/6)

Season ticket for complete course 10/- (SCR and students 7/6)

**Please send stamped addressed envelope for particulars
of reading-lists, etc., to**

***The Secretary, Medical Section, SCR,
14 Kensington Square, London, W.8.***

Pavlova lived up to her own dictum, "one must be utterly devoted to beauty", must be qualified, for it is true only of the beauty of her own dancing, which shone against a background of provincial ensembles and scenery; his argument to the contrary is most unconvincing.

Pavlova's partner, Novikov, confirms this well-known fact in this very book. "But it was the personal success of her great talent, for her productions were reduced to mediocrity by limited funds." Mr. Franks is right, however, in paying Pavlova a tribute by saying that "she was bringing the beauty of the dance to large masses, as distinct from Diaghilev, who sought to excite the cultured few"; and he quotes some very snobbish and non-sensical words of Diaghilev's to prove this.

In writing of form and content, Mr. Franks should have based his argument on the principle that *in art they are inseparable*. Those who are well acquainted with Pavlova's dancing over the years would, I feel, decisively contradict Mr. Franks's opinion that they cannot make fair and accurate comparisons between her and Fonteyn; and it is arrant nonsense to say that one cannot compare the ballet of today with that of twenty-five years ago.

Mr. Haskell's contribution to the book is written in a superficial chatty manner. He says that only an accountant would attempt comparing Pavlova with today's ballerinas. Just as Mr. Franks does, he ignores the fact that without comparisons there are no æsthetic standards. It may be tempting to evade them, but it is dangerous. Furthermore, Mr. Haskell criticises Diaghilev's comparison between Pavlova and Spessivtseva as being ridiculous and unfair—but without quoting it. Actually, Diaghilev said that Spessivtseva was "*plus chaste*", and no one who understands anything about dancing can dispute this.

Ram Gopal's essay traces a revival of Hindu dancing to Pavlova's inspiring incentive. Sol Hurok's "Impresario's Viewpoint" is undistinguished, but he makes one interesting comment. "In another world, under another system, she would have been cherished like a jewel. She would have worked perhaps a few months of the year, would have danced perhaps once or twice a week." And indeed that is the way great ballerinas are cherished in the Soviet Union today. Finally there is a warm appreciation of Pavlova by her "chorus".

Having read this book and looked at the beautiful photographs (*Giselle*, *Autumn Leaves*, *Dragonfly*, and so on) showing Pavlova's expressive hands, one wonders whether she would be so highly extolled by the present-day British school if she were now alive and in her prime. One is bewildered when the same position of the hands, at the same angle, when seen in contemporary ballerinas of the Russian

AVAILABLE FOR THE FIRST
TIME IN ENGLISH !

PAVLOV

SELECTED WORKS

This is the most representative selection of the works of the great Soviet scientist yet published in English. Besides a selection of his lectures and papers on conditioned reflexes, the present volume includes the most essential reports of his work on the circulation of the blood and on digestion, and a wealth of material illustrating his efforts to bring about "the marriage of psychology and physiology" which was part of his scientific aim. It contains important selections from his contributions to psychiatry and his profoundly suggestive hypotheses concerning the "second-signal system" in man—the key to understanding the higher mental activity of the human being. Of special interest is the translation of his famous contributions at the "Wednesday gatherings" held at his laboratory.

Price 10/6 Postage 1/3

From all booksellers

CENTRAL BOOKS
LTD

2 Parton St., London, W.C.1

school, is condemned as "broken wrists",* while Pavlova's similar use of the wrist is said to be "deliberate".

V.K.

* See ANGLO-SOVIET JOURNAL, Vol. XV, No. 1, pp. 56—59.

A DUTY TO BEEKEEPERS AND A PLEASURE TO ALL

Bees. I. Khalifman. (FLPH/Central Books, 7/6.)

"**B**EES do nothing invariably" is a common saying of British beekeepers. Bee colonies under apparently similar conditions as regards locality, numbers, strain, and so on, are apt to react variably, to the confusion of the beekeeper and his textbooks.

Modern scientific research on bees has brought to light a number of astounding facts about the reactions of bees to their environment, facts which have been of great help in enabling the beekeeper to control his stocks with more uniformity. The advice of most expert beekeepers is to use this knowledge in anticipating the bees' demands and in seeking to lead them in the desired direction.

This is not quite the attitude of Mr. Khalifman. He quotes Michurin: "We must not wait for favours from nature; we must wrest them from her."

There is much in this book to excite the reader's interest: why it is that while all other plants and animals domesticated by man have radically changed under his influence bees seem to remain unchanged; how it is that bees are able to raise or lower the temperature of the cluster according to their requirements; and so on.

The bees' ability to communicate a new source of forage, its exact direction, distance and quantity, by means of dances performed by scouts, is extensively dealt with. These dances vary from semi-circular movements to figures of eight, over a small area of the comb surface, and are accompanied by numerous posturing hesitations and waggings of the abdomen, with variations in tempo, all of which have definite meanings. Karl von Frisch, an Austrian professor, was the first to discover the significance of these dances, spending twenty years of his life in doing so.

Bees have no need to carry a watch, as did the White Rabbit in *Alice in Wonderland*, for—as has been proved by experiment—they can be trained to visit selected feeding places at specified times.

Other matters discussed in this book are the senses of sight, taste and/or smell, and hearing; swarming; methods of training bees to pollinate particular plants, for example fruit bushes or red clover; and so on.

Of the greatest interest are the descriptions of experiments and the methods used to enable man to control and change the heredity of organisms and to create new varieties.

This book is complete in scope, detailed without being wearisome, and has given me a better understanding of bees than has any of the many other books on the subject which I have read during forty-five years of beekeeping. I would recommend beekeepers to read it as a duty, and general readers as a pleasure.

F. SINDREY.

THE FIRST PLAN

Works, Vols. XI, XII and XIII. J. V. Stalin. (FLPH and Lawrence & Wishart, 1955, 5/- each volume.)

THE TWO FIRST VOLUMES (XI and XII), covering the years 1928 and 1929 and the first half of 1930, are of more than merely historical interest in that they deal with the launching and the initial period of the first five-year plan, and so with Stalin's dispute with the "Rights" about comparative rates of growth for heavy and light industry. This dispute and its outcome were referred to in the Soviet press early last year, it will be recalled, when discussions and revisions of policy took place relating to this same question.

The famous titles *A Year of Great Change*, *Concerning the Policy of Eliminating the Kulaks as a Class*, and *Dizzy with Success*, remind the reader that this was the period of the crucial "second revolution" in Russia—the struggle for mass-scale, country-wide collectivisation of agriculture. Here, incidentally, is the back-

**We buy collections of
books and pamphlets on
the Soviet Union and
Socialism.**

☆ ☆ ☆

Write first to

**THE HAMMERSMITH
BOOKSHOP**

**3 Beadon Road
London, W.6**

RIVerside 6807

ground to the section called *State Grain Farm No. 5* in Kaverin's novel *Open Book*, recently published in English by Lawrence and Wishart.

Among the works published in these volumes for the first time is a letter to Bill-Belotserkovsky (February 2, 1929: XI, 341-344). Stalin chides the playwright for suggesting that such plays as Bulgakov's *Days of the Turbins* be banned. "What is easiest must not be considered the best. It is not a matter of banning but of step by step ousting the old and new non-proletarian trash from the stage by competing against it, by creating genuine, interesting, artistic Soviet plays capable of replacing it."

Also published for the first time is a letter to Bezymensky (March 19, 1930: XII, 206) replying to his criticism of two current works of fiction as being "petty-bourgeois" and "anti-Party". Stalin defends them, observes that "their message lies in the concentration on the shortcomings of our apparatus and in their profound belief that these shortcomings can be corrected", and gives as his opinion that this "is also their principal merit".

In a third letter published for the first time (to Felix Kon, July 9, 1929: XII, 118-121), he retorts sharply to apparent insinuations that he should not have written a foreword to a pamphlet on the then burning question of socialist emulation, by an unknown writer who, out of inexperience, had made some mistakes. "I am emphatically opposed to supplying forewords only to pamphlets by the 'bigwigs' of the literary world", Stalin writes. "I think it is high time for us to abandon this *aristocratic* habit of giving prominence to literary 'bigwigs', who are prominent enough as it is, and from whose 'greatness' young literary forces have to suffer, writers who are known to none and ignored by all." No doubt the writer of the pamphlet should be "properly taken to task in the press for her errors. But I am decidedly opposed to having this undeniably capable authoress done to death and buried. As to withdrawing Comrade Mikulina's pamphlet from sale, in my opinion that wild idea should be left 'without sequel'."

The last volume is the English version of the last one in the series which began to appear in Russian in 1946 and ended in 1949. It is of exceptional interest in that it covers the period (July 1930 to January 1934) when Soviet Russia made its biggest impact on the western world since the years immediately following the revolution—the period when a wave of British tourists swept into the country where socialism was being built, to pile up a mountain of books about it on their return, when the SCR was able to include a *We Have Been to Russia* dinner as an annual feature of its programme, and when many now in their forties first became interested in Soviet affairs. With the great

changes of these years—the successful completion of the first five-year plan and the launching of the second, and the profound alteration in the pattern and tone of Soviet society resulting from them—Stalin was associated more closely than any other personality and then emerged as the undisputed leading figure in the USSR even while still holding no government office.

American specialists played a notable part in rendering the help needed by the Russian workers, and the book contains a number of generous tributes by Stalin to the value of this help, to American "efficiency" generally and to the courage and realism of President Roosevelt, who in 1933 took the step of establishing diplomatic relations between the USSR and the United States. Also of particular interest in the sphere of foreign relations are the interview with Walter Duranty in December 1933, when the possibility of a change in the Soviet attitude to the League of Nations was first publicly hinted at, in connection with the increasing aggressiveness of German and Japanese policy; the historic prophecy, in January 1934, that attempts by outside powers to exploit the weakness and disunity of China would result, as had happened in Germany and Italy, in a great national movement to make the country united and truly independent; and the no less historic warning on the same occasion that, should war be launched against the USSR, "Let not MM. the bourgeoisie blame us if some of the governments near and dear to them, which today rule happily 'by the grace of God', are missing on the morrow of such a war."

BRIAN PEARCE.

CHESS MASTERS

Chess and Chessmasters. G. Stahlberg. Translated and edited by H. Golombek. (G. Bell and Sons Ltd., 12/6.)

THIS is the first of the Swedish Grandmaster's books to be translated into English. It more than deserves the praise it received when published in his own country. A warm welcome should await it from the average county and club players.

It consists of studies of the great masters from Laskar to the present day, including a section on some of the younger Soviet masters. In addition to the biographical material, forty-three typical games are presented. Both the selection and the analysis are extremely good. In this edition Mr. Golombek has added an additional section on Grandmaster Stahlberg.

K.W.W.

Brief Notice

A History of Russia. Sir Bernard Pares. (Jonathan Cape, 30/- r.e.)

THIS is a reprint of the 1947 edition of Pares's famous book, first published in

1926, with additional material in the form of a brief biographical introduction on his father (who died in 1949) by Richard Pares, and a much-enlarged bibliography, compiled by Eleanor Buist, of Columbia University.

B.P.

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

ABC World Airways Guide. (T. Skinner and Co., 7/6.)

Cavalier of the Gold Star. S. Babayevsky. (Lawrence and Wishart, 12/6.)

Early History of the Russia Company. T. S. Willan. (Manchester University Press, 30/-.)

Hotels in the British Isles. (British Travel and Holidays Association, 5/-.)

Lenin: A Biography. (Lawrence and Wishart, 7/6.)

Peter the First. A. Tolstoy. (Lawrence and Wishart, 12/6.)

Peter the Great. C. de Grunwald. (Douglas Saunders/MacGibbon and Kee, 21/-.)

Regimen and Treatment of Tuberculosis of the Lungs. S. Nezlin. (FLPH, unpriced.)

Selected Correspondence. Marx — Engels. (Lawrence and Wishart, 10/6.)

Selected Works. I. P. Pavlov. (Central Books, 10/6.)

Short History of Russia. A. R. Charques. (Phoenix House, 18/-.)

Some Problems of Incentives and Labour Productivity in Soviet Industry. G. R. Barker. (Basil Blackwell, 14/-.)

Soviet Parliament on the Geneva Conference. (Soviet News 4d.)

Soviet Studies: Vol. VII, Nos. 2 and 3, Oct. 1955 and Jan. 1956. (Basil Blackwell, 9/- each.)

Spotlight on Asia. Guy Wint. (Penguin Books, 2/6.)

USSR and Eastern Europe: Regional Economic Atlas. (Oxford University Press, 42/-.)

New S C R periodical

Preparations are being made for the publication this autumn of a quarterly bulletin on **The Arts in the USSR**. This will include articles on cinema, drama, literature and the graphic, plastic and decorative arts. The bulletin is to be printed. Provisional subscription rates are 6/- annually, post free.